### In the Matter Of:

# Page 1 KELLI DENISE GOODE vs CITY OF SOUTHAVEN 2:16-cv-02029

CYRIL WECHT
March 21, 2017



We Bridge the State and Cover the Nation!

www.alphareporting.com

800-556-8974

```
1
             IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
            FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
 2
                        WESTERN DIVISION
 3
     KELLI DENISE GOODE,
                                    CIVIL DIVISION
 4
     individually, and also
     as the Personal
                                    No. 2:16-cv-02029
 5
     Representative of Troy
                                        SHM-cqc
     Charlton Goode,
     Deceased, and as Mother
 6
                                )
                                    DEPOSITION OF
     Natural Guardian, and
                                )
                                    CYRIL H. WECHT, M.D., J.D.
 7
     Next Friend of R.G., a
                                    MARCH 21, 2017
     Minor, and also on
 8
     behalf of all similarly
                                    Called on behalf of
     situated persons,
                                    Defendant
 9
             Plaintiff,
                                    Counsel of record for
10
        vs.
                                    this Party:
     THE CITY OF SOUTHAVEN,
11
                                )
                                    Marty R. Phillips, Esq.
     TODD BAGGETT,
                                )
                                    RAINEY, KIZER,
12
     Individually, JEREMY
                                    REVIERE & BELL, PLC
     BOND, Individually,
                                )
                                    105 S. Highland Avenue
13
     TYLER PRICE,
                                )
                                    Jackson, TN 38301
     Individually, JOEL
                                    731-426-3128
     RICH, Individually,
     JASON SCALLORN,
     Individually, STACIE J.
15
     GRAHAM a/k/a WITTE,
16
     Individually, MIKE
     MUELLER, Individually,
17
     WILLIAM PAINTER, JR.,
     Individually, BRUCE K.
18
     SEBRING, Individually,
     JOSEPH SPENCE,
19
     Individually, RICHARD
     A. WEATHERFORD,
20
     Individually, JOHN DOES
     1-10, BAPTIST MEMORIAL
21
     HOSPITAL-DESOTO, a
     Mississippi Corporation
22
     SOUTHEASTERN EMERGENCY
     PHYSICIANS, INC., a
23
     Tennessee Corporation,
     and LEMUEL DONJA
24
     OLIVER, M.D.,
25
             Defendants.
```

DEPOSITION OF CYRIL H. WECHT, M.D., J.D., a witness herein, called by the Defendant, Jemuel Donja Oliver, MD, taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, by and before Kathy D. Landock, a Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and a Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, at 1119 Penn Avenue, Suite 404, Pittsburgh, PA 15222, on Tuesday, March 21, 2017 commencing at 9:09 a.m. 

```
3
     COUNSEL PRESENT:
 1
 2
 3
     For the Plaintiff:
              John Timothy Edwards, Esquire
 4
              BALLIN, BALLIN & FISHMAN, PC
               200 Jefferson Avenue
 5
               Suite 1250
              Memphis, TN 38103
 6
              T. 901-525-6278
              E. tedwards@bbfpc.com
 7
 8
     For the Defendant, Lemeul Donja Oliver, MD:
              Marty R. Phillips, Esquire
 9
              RAINEY, KIZER, REVIERE & BELL, PLC
              105 South Highland Avenue
10
              Jackson, TN 38301
              T. 731-426-3128
11
              E. mphillips@raneykizer.com
12
     and
13
              J. Ric Gass, Esquire
              GASS WEBER MULLINS, LLC
14
              309 North Water Street
              Milwaukee, WI 53202
15
              T. 414-224-7697
              E. gass@gasswebermullins.com
16
17
     For the Defendants, City of Southaven, Todd Baggett,
     Jeremy Bond, Tyler Price, Joel Rich, Jason Scallorn,
     Stacie Graham, Mike Mueller, William Painter, Jr.,
18
     Bruce Sebring, and Richard Weatherford:
19
               (Via Telephone Conference):
              L. Bradley Dillard, Esquire
20
              MITCHELL McNUTT & SAMS, PA
              105 South Front Street
21
              Tupelo, MS 38804
              T. 662-842-3871
22
              E. bdillard@mitchellmcnutt.com
23
24
25
```

```
4
     COUNSEL PRESENT (Cont.):
 1
 2
     For the Defendant, Baptist Memorial
 3
     Hospital-Desoto, Inc.:
               David W. Upchurch, Esquire
 4
               John M. McIntosh, Esquire (Via Telephone)
               UPCHURCH & UPCHURCH, PA
 5
               141 South Commerce Street
               Suite B
 6
               Tupelo, MS 38803
               T. 662-260-6952
 7
               E. dupchurch@upchurchpa.com
 8
     For the Defendant, Southeastern Emergency
 9
     Physicians, Inc.:
               Stephen P. Miller, Esquire
10
               McDONALD KUHN
               5400 Poplar Avenue
11
               Suite 330
               Memphis, TN 38119
12
               T. 901-526-0606
               E. smiller@mckuhn.com
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1			INDEX		5
2					
3	WITNESS			PAGE	
4	CYRIL H. WE	CHT, M.	.D., J.D.		
5	br. Ma	Dh i i i			
	by Mr	. Phill	ırch	7 133	
6	by Mr	. Dilla	ard	149	
7					
8			EXHIBITS		
9				PAGE	
10	Exhibit No.	1	Authorization	11	
11	Exhibit No.	2	Autopsy Report	13	
12	Exhibit No.	3	Toxicology Report	22	
13	Exhibit No.	4	Summary of Clinical		
14			History	40	
15	Exhibit No.	5	Journal Article	88	
16	Exhibit No.	6	Article	94	
17	Exhibit No.	7	Article	100	
18	Exhibit No.	8	Dr. DiMaio excerpts	102	
	Exhibit No.	9	Fee Schedule	114	
L9	Exhibit No.	10	Invoices	114	
20	Exhibit No.	11	Notice of Deposition	123	
21	Exhibit No.	12	PCP Records	124	
22	Exhibit No.	13	August 2015 Letter from	- <b>-</b> -	
23	= 9 2,0,	- <del>-</del>	Mr. Upchurch	126	
24	Exhibit No.	14	July 18, 2015		
25			Interview Statement	127	

1			ΕXΙ	HIBITS (Cont.)	PAGE	6
2					PAGE	
3	Exhibit	No.	15	Correspondence Folder	129	
4	Exhibit	No.	16	Autopsy Report Folder	129	
5	Exhibit	No.	17	Timeline Folder	130	
6	Exhibit	No.	18	September 28, 2015 Letter	132	
7	Exhibit	Nos.	19-35	Reproduction of		
8				Dr. Wecht's File Folders	152	
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

```
7
 1
                     PROCEEDINGS
 2
 3
                    CYRIL H. WECHT, M.D., J.D.,
     having been first duly sworn, was examined and
 4
 5
     testified as follows:
 6
 7
                     EXAMINATION
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
 8
 9
         Ο.
              Tell us your name, please, sir.
10
         A.
              Cyril H. Wecht.
11
              Dr. Wecht, your CV indicates you had a
         0.
     birthday yesterday; is that right?
12
13
         A.
              Yes.
14
         0.
              Happy belated birthday.
15
         Α.
              Thank you.
16
         Q.
              You were 86 yesterday?
17
         Α.
              Yes.
18
              Did you do a private autopsy on Trey Goode?
         Ο.
19
         Α.
              Yes.
20
         Q.
              I said Trey. Excuse me, Troy Goode.
21
         A.
              Yes.
22
              Where was that done?
         Q.
23
              Carlow University, where I do all my
         Α.
24
     autopsies. It's about ten minutes from here, what we
25
     call the Oakland section of town, toward the
```

8 1 universities. 2 Q. The report that we've been submitted in this case for you indicates that that autopsy was done on 3 July 20, 2015. Is that date correct? 4 5 Α. Yes. I believe you still have some records down there. May I see those? 6 7 July 23, 2015, correct. 8 Ο. I'm sorry, what date did you say? 9 Α. July 23, 2015. 10 Ο. In the letter dated December 5, 2016 to 11 Mr. Edwards, which has been provided to us as part of your disclosure, on page 3 of that letter it says 12 13 postmortem exam on July 20, 2015, Dr. Wecht's 14 autopsy, and then it lists a number. 15 Α. Then that's incorrect. The correct date is July 23, because that's what was dictated right by me 16 17 at the autopsy. 18 Do you know how the date of July 20 came to 19 be included in the report? 20 Α. Can I see that letter, please? 21 Ο. Sure. 22 Α. Is this the page here? 23 Q. Yes, sir. See at the very bottom where it references postmortem. 24 25 Α. The answer is it's a mistake. The report

that I sent him on December 5, 2016, my mistake or my 1 2 secretary's mistake, but the correct date is July 23. 3 Q. Did you list a time that you performed the 4 autopsy? 5 Α. It says here 3:30 p.m., that's eastern standard time. 6 Is that the time it was commenced or 7 Ο. 8 completed? 9 Α. That's when it started. 10 Ο. How long did it take? 11 Α. Oh, I don't know, usually about an hour and 12 a half in a case like this. 13 Ο. Did anybody assist you with the autopsy? 14 Α. Yes. I have an assistant, Joseph Mancuso, 15 my long time assistant. 16 Ο. What is Mr. Mancuso's training? 17 He's trained as a pathology assistant. is a licensed funeral director. He's a licensed 18 embalmer. And he's then been doing autopsies for 19 20 about 40 years or so, as an assistant. 21 Ο. What did he actually do with regard to 22 Mr. Goode's autopsy? He helps me with -- he does the heavy 23 Α. lifting with the body. And then he will do a lot of 24 physical things, getting the body ready, take it out 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

10 of the Zeigler case in which it had been submitted; and in this case taking apart the strings from the previous autopsy and looking at the organs and so on. Those are the things that he does. Would he have any role in providing any Ο. gross description or microscopic description? Α. No. All of that would have been done by you? Ο. Α. Yes. Q. Was the body embalmed when it came to you? Α. No. Do you recall or can you tell us when you Q. were first contacted about this matter? Α. It would have been as I recall then by phone from Mr. Edwards probably a few days before the body was sent to me. So I would just say it could have

- been around July 20, a day or two possibly earlier. Sometime around there
  - Ο. Sometime around July 20 you think?
- Yeah, a few days prior to the body being Α. shipped to me.
  - Q. Do you recognize that document, sir?
  - This is the authorization for the Α. Yes. autopsy.
    - Q. Does it bear a fax date at the top?

11 1 Α. July 21, 2015. 2 The authorization is signed by Mrs. Goode Ο. and also an attorney; is that right? 3 4 Α. Yes. 5 MR. PHILLIPS: Mark the authorization as 6 Exhibit No. 1. 7 (Deposition Exhibit No. 1 was marked for identification.) 8 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 9 10 Ο. When you were initially contacted by Mr. Edwards, what information were you given? 11 12 Α. I don't recall specifically, but my recollection is I was told that this was a young man 13 14 who had the basics; had gone to a concert with his 15 wife and friends and then had some behavioral problems afterwards; I'm not sure if I was told then 16 that he had taken LSD, I probably was; and then he 17 was arrested, and that he died sometime thereafter 18 19 within a couple of hours after being in police 20 custody; and then an autopsy had been done there and the family wanted a second autopsy. 21 22 Were you given any information about the Ο. 23 manner in which he was restrained? 24 At that time, I don't think so. Α. I do believe some comment was made about his having been 25

1	restrained, but not in the kind of detail that I
2	subsequently came to learn.
3	Q. At the time that you did the autopsy on July
4	23, had you been provided any records to review about
5	Mr. Goode?
6	A. No. As I recall, I did not have the records
7	at that time.
8	Q. Did you prepare an autopsy report?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Do you have any idea why it has not been
11	previously provided to us before today?
12	A. You would have to speak to Mr. Edwards about
13	that.
14	Q. Do you have your autopsy report in front of
15	you?
16	A. Yes.
L 7	MR. PHILLIPS: I would like to mark it as
18	Exhibit No. 2, please. I'm happy to make whatever
19	accommodations we need to, doctor, with regard to
2 0	copies and all so you have a complete file when we
21	leave.
22	THE WITNESS: What did you say, the second
23	part?
24	BY MR. PHILLIPS:
25	Q. I'm happy to make any accommodations for

		13
1	copying.	
2	A. I can have it copied now.	
3	Q. I would rather not stop.	
4	A. You want to refer to it?	
5	Q. Yes. We can substitute a copy later.	
6	(Deposition Exhibit No. 2 was marked for	
7	identification.)	
8	BY MR. PHILLIPS:	
9	Q. Did you let Mr. Edwards or Mr. McCormack	
10	know that you had prepared an autopsy report?	
11	A. Yes, best of my recollection is it would	
12	have been sent to Mr. Edwards.	
13	Q. Do you have any correspondence showing that	
14	the autopsy report was sent to counsel who retained	
1.5	you?	
16	A. Not specifically, no.	
17	Q. I've not had a chance to read your autopsy	
18	report, but in the report did you reach a conclusion,	
19	did you state a conclusion as to the cause of death?	
20	A. No, I did not.	
21	Q. Why is that that you did not state a	
22	conclusion as to the cause of death in your autopsy	
23	report?	
24	A. I did not find anything in the autopsy	
25	itself that permitted me to give an anatomical	

14 pathological cause of death. 1 2 Also, I knew that an autopsy had been done. I always want to see the original autopsy report. 3 also knew the toxicology tests were being performed 4 there and that I was going to submit some stuff for 5 toxicology also. 6 So that's the way you handle it then, 7 pending further information, toxicology results and 8 9 clinical background. 10 Q. At the time of the autopsy you were able to make a gross observation of the body and the organs; 11 12 right? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. Meaning with the naked eve? 15 Α. Yes. 16 And you're also preparing slides that you'll Ο. 17 evaluate under the microscope? 18 Α. Yes. I take pieces of tissue and submit 19 them to the histopathologist for preparation of 20 slides. 21 Q. And are you the one who actually analyzes 22 the slides? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Does your autopsy report, which we've marked Q. as Exhibit No. 2, describe what you saw on the 25

15 1 microscopic examinations? 2 Α. No, it does not. 3 Q. Is there anything that you have prepared that would tell us how you interpreted the slides? 4 I don't know if anything specific is there 5 Α. in terms of findings because there wasn't anything of 6 a definitive nature insofar as determining cause of 7 8 death. 9 Yes, if you'll look on page 4 of my autopsy report you'll see the statement 29 H and E, this 10 11 refers to the kind of stain, stain slides labeled CHW 12 15-275 T. Goode show autolyzed organs without any 13 specific histopathologic alterations. 14 So that sums it up, there wasn't anything of 15 a specific relevant nature insofar as determining 16 cause of death is concerned. 17 Do I understand correctly then, Dr. Wecht, 18 that based upon your gross description and your findings at autopsy you could not reach a conclusion 19 20 as to cause of death; right? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Ο. And based upon your analysis of the pathology slides, you could not reach a conclusion as 23 24 to cause of death? 25 I could not. Α.

16 1 On that page to which you just referenced Q. from your report, it's the letter dated December 5, 2 2016 to Mr. Edwards, you give a reference to this 3 particular case, CHW. Do you see that? 4 Α. 5 Yes. 6 Ο. That's because you're the one who did the 7 autopsy, those are your initials? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Ο. And then 15, is that the year of the exam? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Q. And what does 275 mean? 12 Α. That was the number of the autopsy as of that time. 13 14 Q. For the year 2015? 15 Α. As of July 23, yes. 16 So that would mean that Mr. Goode's autopsy Ο. was the 275th autopsy you had done that year; is that 17 18 right? 19 Α. Up until July 23, yes. 20 Sure, at the time you assigned the number? Q. 21 Α. Yes. 22 Did you talk to anyone besides Mr. Edwards Q. before doing the autopsy? 23 24 Α. No. 25 Did you ultimately get a copy of the autopsy Ο.

report prepared by the Mississippi medical examiner?

A. Yes.

- Q. Do you know when you received that?
- A. No, I do not have a date showing the time that I received that report.
- Q. Do you know at what point in time you did reach a conclusion as to cause of death?
- A. Yes. It would have been sometime shortly before I submitted my report, some days. But once I conclude things, then I go about and I submit the report.

The report was submitted, my narrative report, to Mr. Edwards dated December 5, 2016. So I would say probably sometime after Thanksgiving, at the end of November and going into the first couple days of December, that's when I would have finalized everything and prepared a report, because once I put everything together, then that's the time I do the final report.

- Q. And you would not have reached a conclusion as to cause of death until then?
- A. I might have had some thoughts, I'm sure I did, but I would say that I would not have reached a final conclusion until I had reviewed everything and thought it through and so on until around the time

18

that I sent it. 1 2 Ο. I want you to assume that Mr. Edwards 3 provided a statement to the press on November 18, 2015 in which he said that he had made arrangements 4 for an independent autopsy and that he had been in 5 possession of the doctor's opinion for months. 6 Α. I'm sorry, what was the date of that. 8 Ο. November 18, 2015. 9 Α. The statement was what? 10 Q. The statement was made on November 18, 2015 11 that he had made arrangements for an independent 12 autopsy to be performed and that he had been in 13 possession of the doctor's opinions for months. 14 MR. EDWARDS: Object to the form. BY MR. PHILLIPS: 15 16 Ο. Is that an accurate statement, as far as you 17 know? 18 I can't speak for Mr. Edwards. I'm sure that I would have talked with him. As to what he 19 concluded or inferred from any comments that I made, 20 21 I can't tell you. 22 I can only tell you that my recollection is 23

I can only tell you that my recollection is based upon really more a matter of my modus operandi than a specific chronological recollection down to the day or even the specific week, that when I get

24

25

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

around to writing the written report it's pretty darn close to when I have finalized things in my mind, because I'm pretty active and got a lot of reports to do and so on, so it doesn't make sense for me to think things through and then come back to them weeks or months later.

It may well be that I discussed with Mr. Edwards after having received information of the background of this event and discussion about what had transpired and then referring to the original autopsy report that I may well have told him what I was thinking. That certainly is quite possible and logical.

As to what Mr. Edwards chose to say, I can't tell you. Attorneys say things whenever they want to for their purposes, as all of you gentlemen I'm sure know. How that relates to the rest of reality and the rest of the world involved in the matter, that's something that I can't deal with. That's part of the legal process.

- Q. As of December 5, 2016 when you wrote this report to which you made reference earlier, had you reviewed the autopsy report from the Mississippi medical examiner?
  - A. When I submitted my report on December 5, is

that your question?

- Q. Yes, sir. By that time had you reviewed the autopsy report from the Mississippi medical examiner?
- A. I'm trying to see here. Because you asked me earlier when had I received it, and I told you I don't know. I'm looking at my report to see if I refer to that initial autopsy report. I do not.

That kind of suggests to me, I can't be positive, but it kind of suggests to me that I had not received it, although I don't see why I would not have received it. I just can't be certain. Usually, however, I would mention what had been issued in such a report, and I see no such reference.

- Q. In fact, in your December 5, 2016 letter to Mr. Edwards there's not a reference to the autopsy report from Mississippi, is there?
  - A. That is correct.
- Q. Are you telling us that it would be your practice to make reference to it if you had received it and reviewed it up until that point?
- A. Usually I do. It's not any rigid, self-imposed rule, but much more often, most often I do make reference to an earlier autopsy report.
- Q. Did you do toxicology studies yourself or have them done?

1	A. I submitted stuff for toxicology. I myself,
2	I'm not a toxicologist, I don't do the testing.
3	Q. Yes, sir, but you retrieved samples and
4	submitted them for analysis; is that right?
5	A. Yes, I did.
6	Q. Do you have copies of the toxicology studies
7	there?
8	A. Yes, I do.
9	Q. Have you provided that to anybody before
10	today?
11	A. Again, I would think that I had passed this
12	on to Mr. Edwards, but I cannot say for certain
L3	because I do not have such a covering letter.
L4	Q. May I see the toxicology reports?
L5	A. Wait a minute, this one does say to
L 6	Mr. Edwards on August 14, 2016. So I correct what I
L 7	just said, there is a cover letter for this.
L8	Q. Is this the entirety of the toxicology
L9	analysis that you had done?
20	A. Not that I had done. That's the entirety of
21	their report.
22	Q. Yes, sir. But you requested them to do the
23	analysis is my point?
24	A. Oh, yes. Of course.
25	Q. That's the entirety of the report you got

1	back?
2	A. Yes. This is all I have, from the liver
3	tissue that I submitted to them.
4	MR. PHILLIPS: Let's mark this as Exhibit
5	No. 3.
6	(Deposition Exhibit No. 3 was marked for
7	identification.)
8	BY MR. PHILLIPS:
9	Q. Are you able to tell when you received the
10	toxicology results that we've marked at Exhibit
11	No. 3, Dr. Wecht?
12	A. Well, they should have a date on their
13	report. Their report, report issued it says here
L4	August 4, 2015.
L5	Q. Can you tell us when you received it then?
L6	A. Well, usually it takes a day or two in the
L7	mail. A couple days usually it comes in. So it
L 8	would have been August 5, August 6, something like
L9	that.
20	Q. The specimens that were taken would have
21	been drawn on July 23 at the time of your autopsy;
22	right?
23	A. Yes. Not drawn because there were no body
24	fluids. It was liver tissue that was submitted and
25	brain tissue. I submitted liver, kidney and brain to

them. They chose to do tests on liver.

- Q. So there's no blood submitted?
- A. No.

- Q. Why is that?
- A. Because the body had already been autopsied. There was no blood. Any little seepage that remained would have been exposed and any results would not be valid because whatever seepage there was also would have been a confluence of fluid from who knows where in the body. So there's no way you can submit blood in a case like this.
- Q. Does that impede at all the ability to do a toxicology analysis if one is drawing a specimen or retrieving a specimen about five days after death as opposed to doing it shortly after death?
- A. No. Within a matter of a few days, you don't need blood. It's always best to have urine and blood and bile from the gallbladder in a fresh case, but you can get body organs and tissues, and if they have not been embalmed, then you can get a reliable test from tissues.

The liver is the source of metabolism for most of the drugs in the body, and that's why that is the organ of preference for the toxicology lab to test.

1	Q. What did that report indicate with regard to
2	the toxicology analysis?
3	A. Just a positive test for a metabolite of
4	some kind, Beta-Phenethylamine and Delta-9 Carboxy
5	THC, Tetrahydrocannabinol, 870 nanograms per gram.
6	Q. Is that the active ingredient in marijuana?
7	A. No. I believe it's an inactive. Delta-9,
8	this is an inactive metabolite. Delta-9 Carboxy
9	THC is an inactive metabolite and so stated, by the
10	way, in the autopsy report. It's not my subjective
11	interpretation.
12	It's Delta-9 THC that is the active
13	metabolite. Delta-9 Carboxy THC is an inactive
14	metabolite.
15	Q. From marijuana?
16	A. Yes.
L 7	Q. What else did it show?
L8	A. Well, as I referred to, some
L 9	Beta-Phenethylamine, which is I think just I'm not
20	sure from which drug it comes. It's not one of the
21	toxic drugs.
22	Q. Any other positive findings?
23	A. No, not in this report, no.
24	Q. Did you have made available to you the
25	toxicology report that was done in Mississippi?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. What is the date on the toxicology report
3	from Mississippi?
4	A. September 17, 2015.
5	Q. September what?
6	A. 17, 2015.
7	Q. Thank you.
8	Do you know when you received that report?
9	A. No, I have no specific date when it was
10	submitted to me. Hold on. No, I was thinking about
11	photos that came in later. No, I cannot tell you the
12	date when I received it from Mr. Edwards.
13	Q. In your report, which is your letter of
14	December 5, 2016 to Mr. Edwards, did you make any
15	reference at all to the toxicology report you had
16	received?
17	A. No, I don't believe so.
18	Q. Did you make any reference at all to the
19	toxicology report from Mississippi?
20	A. No, I see no specific reference.
21	Q. Isn't that something you would normally do,
22	make reference to the toxicology information and use
23	that as part of your analysis in your report?
24	A. I would if I felt that it was relevant. If
25	I felt that it had played any role in leading to the

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

death, of course I would include it because it would be a substantive, highly relevant component of such a report. If it is of no consequence, then I might not refer to it.

- Q. Would it be your practice not even to reference the fact it had been done?
- A. I cannot tell you. Much of the time I will reference it, sometimes for the reasons I just stated I would not.

The other thing here is, I think you already asked me when did I receive all of those things. I'm just wondering, and I said I don't recall when I received everything, including the autopsy report from Mississippi, of which the toxicology report is an integral component.

So I'm not sure if I had it at that time. I probably did have it because I, of course, discussed in conclusions of my report whether LSD was a cause of death or contributed to the death. So I can't be certain.

But as I've already said, those toxicological findings from the same laboratory, National Medical Services, on the report, on the original autopsy report, I find nothing there that is of substantive significance to my analysis of the

27 case, specifically in determining the cause of this 1 2 man's death. 3 Q. Does the Mississippi toxicology report give an LSD concentration, does it report an LSD 4 5 concentration? 6 Α. Yes, it does. 7 Would you look at page 4 of your report 0. dated December 5, 2016. 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 Ο. Next to the last -- well, three paragraphs 11 from the bottom, second sentence, you state, I do not 12 find any LSD concentration reported for Mr. Troy 13 Goode.

Did you make that statement?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Yes. And I'm referring to the NMS report that I had received, that is correct.
- Q. Did you not have the Mississippi toxicology report?
- A. My answer is as I gave it two minutes ago, I kind of think I did not because I did not refer to it at all, but I cannot be absolutely certain because I don't have the date when I received that material.
- Q. You made a conclusion about LSD without knowing the concentration of LSD in Mr. Goode's body at the time of death, didn't you?

28 1 Α. That indeed may be possible. Aqain, I referred to the NMS report which I had received. 2. 3 Q. Other than your report which we've marked as an exhibit regarding the autopsy, Exhibit No. 2, did 4 5 you make any notes pertaining to the autopsy? 6 Α. No. 7 Ο. Did you take any photographs? 8 Α. No. 9 Q. Any videotapes? 10 Α. I dictate -- no, sorry. Video, no, 11 there are no videos. 12 Q. Is it typical to take photographs at the 13 time of autopsy? 14 That varies from one office to another. Some offices, the larger medical examiner coroner's 15 16 offices routinely take photos. 17 In my case when photos are deemed relevant, 18 they are taken usually by the state police or detectives attending the autopsy. Sometimes I will 19 take photos myself in private autopsies when they are 20 relevant. If the photos are not going to be 21 22 relevant, I do not take photos. 23 Did you write any letter reporting your 24 findings other than the December 5, 2016 letter to 25 Mr. Edwards?

	2
1	A. No, I have no such letter.
2	Q. Tell me if you recognize that document.
3	A. This looks like the report that I submitted
4	to Mr. Edwards. Yes, it appears to be exactly the
5	same thing.
6	Q. What is the date on that letter?
7	A. September 28, 2015.
8	Q. Is that your letter?
9	A. Yes.
10	MR. EDWARDS: May I ask where you got this?
11	MR. PHILLIPS: It's in the Sun Life records.
12	MR. EDWARDS: Preliminary reports are not
13	discoverable under the federal rules. I believe
14	that's what that is.
15	BY MR. PHILLIPS:
16	Q. Is this your report regarding your findings
17	pertaining to Mr. Troy Goode?
18	A. Yes. It appears to be exactly my report. I
19	don't see any changes. Number of pages, jumping to
20	the end. Yes, it definitely came from me, and it
21	appears to be the same.
22	Q. So when you told us earlier that you didn't
23	reach a conclusion as to the cause of death until
24	maybe end of November, early December 2016, was that
25	an error on your part?

- A. Yes. Obviously, then I had reached a conclusion in September. Of course that explains why Mr. Edwards was making the public statement that he did.
- Q. Do you know why this is designated work product at the top?
- A. Yes. I submitted it to Mr. Edwards for him to look at to see if there are any mistakes, any errors, whether there was something that I had not referred to. That's the reason it was sent to him.
- Q. Was this report, and I'm referring to the one dated September 28, 2015, was it in any way designated as a preliminary report or draft report?
- A. Well, referred to as work product. So to m that's synonymous with a draft report or a preliminary report or privileged, confidential. Those terms are used by me synonymously to characterize it as not the final written report.
- Q. Is there any significant difference between the letter of September 28, 2015 and your letter of December 5, 2016?
- A. No. I think I've stated a couple of times already here today that my fast perusal, it is exactly the same. I see no difference at all in anything. Spacing looks to me to be exactly the same

```
31
 1
     thing.
             No, it looks to me to be exactly the same.
 2
              MR. GASS: Are you both looking at December
 3
     reports?
 4
              MR. EDWARDS:
                             This is September.
 5
              MR. GASS: And the one he was looking at?
 6
              MR. EDWARDS:
                            December.
 7
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
 8
         Q.
              The autopsy that you did on July 23, 2015,
     how would it differ from the autopsy that was
 9
10
     performed by you as the first autopsy?
              I don't know what you mean how it would
11
         Α.
12
              Obviously, the organs have been resected
13
     internally, brain and thoracic, abdominal organs.
                                                         So
     reopening those lines of incision, you don't see the
14
15
     organs in situ.
16
              External examination doesn't differ, what
     somebody says they see and what I see; but as far as
17
     the outside of the body is concerned, except for a
18
     little bit of early discoloration or so on, but
19
20
     basically the same, not exactly.
21
              And then not seeing the organs in situ
     obviously is different than the original autopsy.
22
23
              MR. DILLARD: I'm sorry, what was the date
24
     of that autopsy?
25
              THE WITNESS: My autopsy?
```

32 1 MR. DILLARD: Yes, sir. Was it the July 20? 2 THE WITNESS: July 23. 3 MR. EDWARDS: July 20 was the State of 4 Mississippi autopsy. 5 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 6 So when you received the body, had the 7 organs been removed from the body? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Q. So the organs came to you separate and apart from the body? 10 Well, no, not separate. They're with the 11 Α. 12 body. 13 But they had been removed from the body? 14 But they had been detached from their 15 respective soft tissue moorings. 16 A couple of things that I did that had not 17 been done, I removed the testes. I also removed -as I recall, made a couple of additional incisions. 18 And then I also dissected musculature in the back, 19 20 the paravertebral musculature and soft tissues, and I 21 also removed the spinal cord. Otherwise, the organs had been detached and submitted. 22 23 Could you just list for us, please, the organs that had been removed before the body came to 24 25 you?

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

A. Brain, lungs, heart, liver, kidney, pancreas, adrenal gland, bladder, prostate, spleen. Those are the organs that are removed.

- Q. Why didn't you go to Mississippi to do the autopsy since the body was there?
- A. I always have the body sent to me. It is preferable for me to do the autopsy here. And I always ask for the body to be sent to me, either driven or sent by air.

It also is less expensive for the attorney, but that's not my main reason or concern, but I always do point that out to the attorney. But I have bodies sent to me not that often, but several in the course of the year every year. And they come to me, most of them are from the areas around here where they can be driven, but a couple or more will be sent by air during the course of a year.

- Q. You didn't find any indication in your analysis of the lung tissue of any pulmonary disease, did you?
- A. No. Nothing that I could determine. As I've already mentioned, both in the report and discussing it today, tissue showed early autolysis, decomposition, so there's some things of a specific microscopic nature that might not be discernible, but

34 I did not find anything grossly such as a tumor or 1 infarct or emphysema, did not find anything like 2 3 that. 4 0. No evidence of asthma? 5 Α. Well, I cannot tell you in terms of a severe 6 asthma producing some bronchiectasis or even 7 emphysematous change, the answer is I did not. 8 Whether there was some evidence microscopically of the bronchial tree, I cannot 9 10 determine that because of early decomposition that 11 would change the mucosal appearance, that is the lining, the mucosa of the airways. 12 13 Q. Did you find any ocular petechial 14 hemorrhages? 15 Externally on the conjunctiva, I did not and 16 I did not remove the eyes. But I saw no evidence of 17 -- you said ocular, didn't you? 18 Ο. Yes, sir. 19 Α. No, I saw no evidence of injuries to the 20 eyes. 21 Ο. Did you find any facial petechial 22 hemorrhages? 23 Α. No. 24 Ο. Did you find any pleural petechial 25 hemorrhages?

A. No.

- Q. Were there any rib fractures?
- A. Yes, there were -- well, no. I say here the bony thorax appears to be intact on palpation except for the postpartum incision. No, I saw no evidence of rib fractures.

Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

- Q. Did you know the Mississippi medical examiner reported rib fractures?
- A. Yes, sir, I came to know that later on, and I think they attributed that to resuscitation.
- Q. Did you conclude that there were rib fractures present or did you disagree with the finding that there were rib fractures?
- A. I've already told you that I did not find rib fractures. The second part of your question, I have no disagreement. They would appear to be the kinds of fractures that we see many times in people who have been resuscitated, right third through fifth and through the seventh.

So no, I would not disagree with that, especially when they say no associated soft tissue hemorrhage. I would agree with that.

Q. When you do a private autopsy as you did on July 23, 2015 on Troy Goode, what is the charge for doing that?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

36 Α. \$3,850 for the autopsy. And then -- that's my charge. Then if they want toxicology then I charge them whatever the amount is that NMS charges. I think that may be \$800, and then the transportation costs. Mr. Edwards sent a check for \$6,475, and the covering letter indicated that that was for autopsy, toxicology and transportation of the decedent. charge is \$3,850 for a private autopsy. Ο. In the report that you prepared dated December 5, 2016, the initial section, and I'm not talking about the autopsy report, doctor, I'm talking about your letter to Mr. Edwards dated December 5, 2016. Do you have your letter to Mr. Edwards dated December 5, 2016 in front of you? Α. I do. The information in the first five paragraphs of the clinical summary, did that information come from Mrs. Goode? Well, it came to me from Mr. Edwards. Α. Ι cannot tell you where he obtained it. I had no contact in any way by letter or phone with Mrs. Goode. So everything I received came from Mr. Edwards.

37 Do I understand you then to say that you 1 Q. never talked to Mrs. Goode? Α. I have not talked with her, never have talked with her. And you haven't received any information in Q. writing or otherwise from Mrs. Goode about the events of July 18? 8 Α. I think that one of the time lines submitted as I recall referred to information from Mrs. Goode, but again transmitted to me via Mr. Edwards, not directly to me. But my recollection is that one of the time 13 lines, because I received a couple of different time lines, I just have a recollection that something was according to Mrs. Goode. So I'm sure that some of the information came from her via Mr. Edwards, but not in personal handwriting. Look at the September 28, 2016 letter you Q. wrote to Mr. Edwards, please. Do you see at the top

- of page 2 you cite the source for the preceding statements as being Mrs. Goode?
  - Α. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ο. But you didn't communicate with Mrs. Goode directly?

- A. I told you, sir, I have never spoken with Mrs. Goode in my life.
- Q. The information in the clinical summary, did you assume those facts to be true?
- A. Yes. And I had collateral information, as I have already referred to by way of time lines, I also had the police report. So the overall scenario is I think pretty consistent from the different sources, whether there's a difference in the specific isolated fact or difference in a specific minute or so, that, I cannot attest to; however, my recollection is that I found nothing of any significant inconsistency among the various chronological reports and summaries as to the events that transpired.

I believe that what I did receive was sufficient to portray a picture for me that was sufficient to arrive at conclusions and opinions.

- Q. In your December 5, 2016 report, you make a statement on page 2 about the summary of Mr. Goode's clinical history submitted by Mr. Tim Edwards.
  - A. What page was that?
- Q. Page 2, sir, three paragraphs from the bottom.
- 24 A. Yes.

Q. Do you have a copy of the clinical summary

that Mr. Edwards submitted to you?

A. Do I have a copy?

- Q. The statement in the report says, the summary of Mr. Goode's clinical history submitted by Mr. Tim Edwards, and then you go on to say what it indicates. I'm looking for that document that you reference in your letter.
- A. Well, they would be probably more than one document by that time. I had received copies of the hospital record, I had received the police report. So those are the things that I referred to submitted by Mr. Edwards. Everything that I got from him is here.
- Q. What I'm trying to understand, doctor, is if, besides the medical records, was there something, some kind of summary?
  - A. Yes. Here's a summary right here.
- Q. Page 2 of this document says at the top summary of clinical history. Am I right, sir, right here?
  - A. Yes. Here's another one, by the way.
- Q. Are there any other summaries of the clinical history you were provided besides these two that you've given me?
  - A. Here's another one.

	40
1	Q. Are there additional ones in your files?
2	A. No. That appears to be everything. Wait,
3	here's another one. Something may be duplicative.
4	Then I got this statement of facts, looks
5	like a legal document. So those are the things that
6	I received.
7	Q. Are these the items to which you make
8	reference in your report when you refer to the
9	summary of the clinical history submitted by
10	Mr. Edwards?
11	A. Yes, collectively.
12	MR. PHILLIPS: Let's mark these collectively
13	as the next exhibit.
14	MR. UPCHURCH: Mr. Phillips, are there five
15	documents in that collective exhibit?
16	MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, there are five different
17	things stapled separately.
18	(Deposition Exhibit No. 4 was marked for
19	identification.)
20	BY MR. PHILLIPS:
21	Q. There's reference in your report I believe
22	to a videotape. Did you get any videotape of what
23	happened out on Goodman Road?
24	A. No.
25	Q. In the September 28, 2015 letter, next to

41 the last paragraph on page 2 you cite as a source 1 2 attorney and video at scene. Do you see that? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Ο. Were you provided a video of what happened 5 at the scene? 6 Α. No. 7 Q. And you've never reviewed one? 8 Α. I have not seen a video, no. 9 Q. In your December 5, 2016 report, on page 4, 10 what's listed there at the top beginning with 11 abrasions, contusions, down through hemorrhage into left there at the end, is that the summary of your 12 13 gross findings at autopsy? 14 Α. Well, where is the autopsy report, do you 15 have it there? 16 Q. Yes, sir. 17 Α. Yes, it appears to be identical listing. 18 Ο. And then the following sentence that begins 29 H and E stain slides in your report, that is your 19 20 general summary of your analysis of the slides; 21 right? 22 Α. Yes. 23 0. Because you told us, Dr. Wecht, that there 24 was no indication of cause of death on your gross 25 findings and no indication of cause of death on the

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

microscopic findings, does that mean that your conclusion about cause of death is based on history?

- A. Based on history, what we call a clinical pathological correlation.
- Q. Can you tell us when you received the medical records that you reviewed in this case?
- A. No, I do not have a covering -- wait, I'm sorry. Here I have a note from Mr. Edwards dated August 10, doctor, here are Troy's medical records from his primary care physician.

That email is dated August 10, 2015. So I guess I would have received it -- well, it's email, so I received it that day.

- Q. Did that transmittal include the records from Baptist Hospital or just records from his primary care physician?
- A. This looks like only from the physician. It does not appear to include the hospital record. The hospital record came separately, and I cannot tell you the time on that.
- Q. I'm interested in trying to determine if we can when you received the Baptist records from the visit of July 18, 2015.
- A. I cannot tell you when I received that. I do not have a covering note on that.

2.4

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

Q. Did you actually review the medical records from Baptist or did you rely upon the clinical summaries provided to you by Mr. Edwards and his office?

A. I had records from Mr. Edwards, information from Mr. Edwards. Here is an August 17, 2015 email from Mr. Edwards referring to reports from the Southaven Police Department. So I had those, because there's a covering note on that.

The autopsy report from the original pathologist. I cannot tell you specifically when I received the Baptist OneCare Hospital record, whether I had that or not. There is no covering note on that, so I cannot tell you about the hospital record, when I received it.

- Q. Whenever you received those hospital records, did you review them or did you rely upon the summaries of those records provided to you by Mr. Edwards and his office?
- A. No, I reviewed them, I reviewed everything that has been sent to me. Once again, just to make it clear, if I found anything of an inconsistent nature of any significance, I would certainly tell you.

There are different things, references here

44 or there, but for me as I have reviewed all these 1 2 records and as I have analyzed and interpreted them 3 for my purpose, I find nothing that is inconsistent. 4 Obviously, some things are more detailed 5 than others, but the scenario is the same, it doesn't 6 change from one report to another. 7 Did you review any depositions taken in this case, doctor? 8 9 Α. No. 10 Ο. You have been an editor for different journals, haven't you? 11 12 A member of the editorial board or Α. Yes. 13 board of editors, not the editor. I'm the editor on 14 some things, but mostly on the editorial boards. 15 I was thinking about the section on page 29 of your CV that's labeled professional publications, 16 17 editorial positions. 18 Α. Yes. 19 Ο. And then you have a series listed there. 20 Α. Yes. 21 Ο. When you hold an editorial position in 22 connection with some journal or publication, what 23 responsibility do you have? 24 You're sent articles to review and then you

send back your analysis, whether it's accepted,

25

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

whether it needs to be revised, any comments and suggestions, that's what you do as a member of an editorial board of a professional journal in my fields of legal medicine and forensic science.

Q. Do you have any responsibility to ensure that the publications in those journals are based upon valid research?

A. I review what's sent to me. If you're asking me do I go back and check every citation and

- A. I review what's sent to me. If you're asking me do I go back and check every citation and reference, no, I do not do that. I review the article and submit my comments.
- Q. When you review an article, do you determine if the conclusions and statements in there are scientifically sound in your field?
  - A. I usually make a comment or so on. The kinds of comments, the extent of the comments will vary from one paper review to another.
  - Q. What is the American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology?
- A. It's the publication of the National
  Association -- well, I don't know if it still is. It
  used to be the publication of the National
  Association of Medical Examiners. It may still be.
  I know there's still an affiliation.

But it is a professional publication. It

1	started off I know as the official publication of the
2	National Association of Medical Examiners. I think
3	it is now an independent journal with some
4	affiliation, but I think I have to pay separately for
5	that now, as I recall. I don't think it comes with
6	my dues.
7	Q. You have been on the editorial board for
8	that publication, haven't you?
9	A. Yes.
LO	Q. Are you still? I think it was page 29 of
L1	the CV where I saw that, doctor.
L2	A. These are a list of articles by me.
L3	Q. May I help you?
L4	A. Here, I have the editorial list.
L5	Q. Page 29 of that document.
L6	A. Yes, right. What is the name of that?
L7	Q. The American Journal of Forensic Medicine
L8	and Pathology.
L9	A. Yes. It says here 1979 to the present, so I
20	am still a member of that journal.
21	Q. Do you regularly meet with that board to
22	provide input or regularly review articles for them?
23	A. No, I do not meet with them. And I cannot
24	say that I regularly provide they come in quite
25	infrequently as I recall for that particular journal.

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

I have several journals for which I review articles. My recollection is for that one that I don't get many articles to review.

- Q. Do you read that journal yourself regularly?
- A. I go through it when I receive it, yes.
- Q. Do you refer to it occasionally in your work and rely upon it?
- A. I do not recall a specific reference, but I incorporate and collocate information from various journals as well as other informational sources. I don't in some way delineate and separate these things in my mind. They just all go into my brain and come out whenever applicable.

I sometimes will refer to a specific journal. I do not recall the last time I referred to that journal specifically in any kind of a report.

- Q. Is the American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology a reliable authority?
- A. Well, all journals are reference sources. It's difficult to answer your question about a reliable authority. People differ. Of course you see that in letters to the editor almost all the time with people expressing different opinions. And then sometimes years later an article that shows that something is incorrect or needed to be changed

significantly.

So I'm not waffling on this. I can't tell you when you say authoritative; it's a respected journal, a respected editor, a respected professional organization and so on.

Is it authoritative? Articles express views

of the authors. Does that make it authoritative? It is certainly, if it's been peer-reviewed, then it's a respected article, but you may disagree with it. That happens all the time in all kinds of professional publications, including scientific ones, let alone things in the realm of law and political science and politics and other things which are much more subjective.

But in my field of forensic science and my field of legal medicine, there are differences of opinion on things. And so, not to say that this journal or this article says this and therefore that is the authority; it doesn't work that way.

- Q. So can there be disagreement among reasonable pathologists about a cause of a particular patient's death?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is the American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology peer-reviewed -- are the articles in

there peer-reviewed?

2.0

- A. Yes, I believe they are.
- Q. Is it a widely used journal?
- A. Well, all the members in name get it, and I can't tell you how many other people, I have no knowledge of that. But if you are a -- well, it used to be that you all get it, every member of name received it. Now it's a fair amount of money. I can't tell you. I still get it, I pay that extra money. I can't tell you, but probably most by far of named members I'm sure do subscribe to the journal, but I can't tell you if it's 100 percent.
  - Q. Is it generally a trustworthy journal?
- A. My answers would be the same as to trustworthy, authoritative. I don't know what you mean by trustworthy. You know, it's a series of articles that have been reviewed by people, and they set fort their opinions.

But it is not as if putting something down in writing makes it a definitive, unassailable nature.

I'll tell you very simply, like I always say, forensic medicine, forensic pathology is not an absolute science; it's not physics, mathematics or chemistry or arguably astronomy. So there are

differences of opinion, as I'm sure there will be in this case. I'm here to express my opinion, sir, and I'm prepared to do that.

- Q. You wouldn't pay to receive a journal that you thought was untrustworthy, would you?
- A. I don't know what you mean by untrustworthy. I don't use that word. You asked me before about authoritative, that's usually a word that is more -- I pay to receive it to learn what people have to say about various matters. Some of them are very esoteric, things of an extremely rare nature.

It's just something that you do if you're active in the field from my perspective to try to keep abreast of things because you don't get new textbooks every year.

- Q. What is the Journal of Forensic Sciences?
- A. That's the publication of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences.
- Q. Are you a member of that academy?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Have you served on the editorial board for this publication?
- A. Yes. Not now, not for some years, but I had been on the editorial board of that publication.
  - Q. Is that a journal that you read regularly?

A. I receive it and I read through it, yes.

Q. Is it widely used in your field?

2.0

A. Again, it goes to all the members of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, and that's the largest forensic scientific group in the country I believe. So the people in the various scientific specialties and subspecialties get that.

The American Academy of Forensic Sciences is comprised of about I think eight or nine sections now and the different forensic scientific fields, so it's a panoply, it's a potpourri of different forensic scientific specialty areas.

- Q. Is it a respected journal in your field?
- A. Yes. My comments are the same. The articles are peer-reviewed. And is it respected?

  Yes, respected. Are there statements and conclusions that one may differ with? Absolutely.
- Q. Are there any sources, whether they be journals or textbooks, in your field that you could identify for me as being a reliable authority?
- A. My answer would be the same for all of the journals in my field, exactly what I have told you; they're peer-reviewed articles, that means they have some credibility, that have been reviewed by two or more members of an editorial board, final review I

2.0

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

guess coming from the editor-in-chief. So they're not considered to be things of a superficial, undocumented nature.

Some people rely more upon one journal than another perhaps. I certainly can't speak for all of my colleagues. There is no one journal that is -- I was going to say like the Bible, a lot of people don't accept the Bible either. So I can't say anything more than I have about these journals.

- Q. What sources would you go to if you needed a reference work, what would be your?
- A. I have a lot of textbooks on pathology and forensic pathology going back from different people, and I have various medical books and journal articles, and sometimes in cases attorneys will send me some things, too, that they may acquire.

And to a great extent I base things on my experience now of 55 years in forensic pathology. That plays a major role. Not as a matter of egocentricity, but in my 55 years for me and my 20,000 autopsies that I have done and 40,000 others that I have reviewed, supervised or signed off on play a major role in leading me to conclusions and opinions on a particular case, whether it's an autopsy that I do or a consultation that I am

reviewing.

- Q. Is there a particular textbook to which you would make reference if you needed to consult one?
  - A. No. It varies. There are some --
- Q. Is there a particular journal that you would reference if you needed to reference a journal?
- A. No. The same answer I gave you. I will grab different things, for example, there's some books on neuropathology, there's some books on liver, there are books that relate to specific organ systems, and then you got other books in the realm of clinical pathology, plus the journals you have mentioned and many other journals.
- Q. In your report of December 5, 2016 you did not cite any specific medical literature, did you?
  - A. No.
- Q. Does that mean that you do not intend to cite or rely upon any specific medical literature in this case for your opinions?
- A. No, I would not say that. I may -- I'm sure that I have read things and am relying upon them that I am aware of, and I most likely did go back to one or more books or articles as I was preparing this report, I have no specific recollection, if I felt that some statement I was making -- well, in this

case I would say for example that, yes, in my report
where I refer to a specific number I think at the end
of my report about quantities -- let me see that.

- Q. Are you looking for your December 5 letter?
- A. Yes, my report.

MR. McINTOSH: I want to state for the record that I am exiting the deposition.

- A. Here on page 4, it gives some specific numbers, I'm sure I got that from an article or a book somewhere. If I give a specific number like that, I referred to the specific quantities of LSD. I would not have known, I doubt that I would have had that in my mind, but let's say I get a case next week or next month, I have a fairly good memory, I may remember the number so the next time it may be coming from my mind. In this case I believe that I would have gotten those numbers from some article. I don't believe I would have had those numbers in my mind.
- Q. Is there any particular medical literature or article that you can tell us you consulted with regard to the LSD opinions on page 4 that you're referencing?
- A. I know there are articles on LSD, and I think I definitely read one or two articles. I cannot give you the authors' names. Several people

have written about LSD.

And of course something else, too, that I referred to for numbers, I received a copy of a report submitted to Mr. Edwards from a recognized expert in the field of LSD, Dr. David E. Nichols, Ph.D., N-i-c-h-o-l-s. He gives specific numbers and he gives specific references to published papers. So I had the benefit of that also in referring to LSD.

- Q. Did you rely upon Dr. Nichols' report to form your opinions?
- A. No. My opinions were the same insofar as whether or not LSD caused the death. I did not need or rely upon Dr. Nichols' report. I am a forensic pathologist, and he is not. I found his report very illuminating and very erudite, but I did not need his report, I did not rely upon his report to arrive at the conclusion that I did vis-a-vis the arguable role of LSD in leading to Mr. Goode's death.
- Q. What is the date of his report, the copy that you have?
  - A. January 11, 2016.
- Q. I may not have understood your answer to this question, so forgive me if I'm repeating myself, you have not cited in your report a specific article or piece of literature; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you intend in this case in conjunction with any opinion you give to cite a specific journal article or textbook?

A. No. If I were testifying today I would give the answers that I've already given you, so I would not have a specific name. It may be that Mr. Edwards will want me to refer to a specific article based upon the opinions I've given, the quantitative numbers I have expressed and so on, in which case I would do so.

But let's say I were testifying today, my answers would be, as I have given you, that I have no specific article I'm referring to, but I have acknowledged that I did acquire specific quantitative numbers relative to LSD toxicity as referred to in my report.

- Q. You didn't in the section on positional asphyxia make any reference to the literature even generally, did you?
  - A. No.
- Q. Has Mr. Edwards or anybody else provided you any articles for you to review in conjunction with this case?
  - A. No, not that I recall.

Q. Have you published anything yourself pertaining to positional asphyxia?

A. I don't recall. I know I've dealt with this and commented on it hundreds and hundreds of times.

I think I probably have. I would have to go through -- one just caught my eye right here now,

Investigation and Analysis of Police-Related Deaths,

No. 56 in my CV at the Arnold Markle Symposium, Henry

C. Lee Forensic Science, University of New Haven.

- Q. Was that a lecture or publication?
- A. That's a publication based upon a lecture.
- Q. Is there a citation given there for that?
- A. Yes. Published in the proceedings of that. I think that any article here which talks about police-related deaths, there's another one I gave at the American College of Forensic Examiners, I

remember that one, in Branson, Missouri, that it would definitely have included reference to that.

I know that there are others. And I have written about this in my textbook, in my own book, so I know that I've written about this because I've been involved in these cases.

Q. Let me try to ask a better question.

I'm not asking about lectures that you may have given. I'm asking about publications that would

58 appear in peer-reviewed journals. Have you submitted 1 any publications to peer-reviewed journals on the 2 topic of positional asphyxia? 3 I do not know offhand if I've had any 4 Α. submitted to a peer-reviewed journal. I have had 5 many published in association with lectures given at 6 various meetings. They would not have been 7 peer-reviewed. 8 Have you conducted any research or testing 9 Ο. regarding positional asphyxia? 1.0 Α. 11 No. Have you submitted any publication to a 12 Ο. peer-reviewed journal regarding LSD? 13 14 Α. No. Excited delirium? 15 Q. Well, no, I do not believe so, no. 16 Α. What is the name of your textbook that you 17 Q. make reference to? 18 Forensic Pathology in Civil and Criminal 19 Α. 2.0 Cases. And you would not acknowledge your own 21 Ο. 22 textbook as a reliability authority, would you? No, people will disagree with me, some 23 Α. So my answer for my own book is the same as 24 people. I have expressed with regard to other people's books 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

2.0

22

24

25

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

59

These are my opinions. Much of it is and articles. hard science which would not differ from one book to another, but there are variations. And then there are areas then which are more subjective.

- Are you familiar with a book called the Handbook of Forensic Pathology by Vincent DiMaio?
- I'm familiar with a book by Dr. Vincent DiMaio. I didn't recall it as a handbook. I thought it's a bigger book. So I don't know that I have a I know Dr. DiMaio has a couple of books or handbook. more. So I'm familiar with the books that he has published, that he has written, yes.
- Do you refer to Dr. DiMaio's books on Ο. occasion?
- I probably do. I think I have one of his Α. And as I say, I'll just grab a book.
- 17 Sometimes I'll look something up in two or three 18 books.
  - Have you, in fact, cited Dr. DiMaio's book Ο. in testimony in other cases?
- 21 Α. I do not know. It is certainly possible that I've done so, but I can't remember specifically. 23 I can't tell you.
  - Is Dr. DiMaio a respected expert in your Q. field?

60 1 Α. Yes. 2 0. Are you familiar with Forensic Pathology, a 3 text whose primary author is Dr. David Dolinak? Α. David? 4 Dolinak. 5 Q. Α. Dolinak? 6 7 Ο. Yes, sir. 8 Α. No, that one I do not know at all, neither 9 the name of the book nor the author, Dolinak, no. 10 Q. What is the Journal of Legal and Forensic 11 Medicine? 12 Α. Which one is that, of Legal and Forensic 13 Medicine? I'm trying to remember which organization 14 publishes that. I know the name, but I'm confused as 15 to -- can you tell me, I don't know which 16 organization -- I'm familiar with that name, I just 17 don't know which professional organization publishes 18 that. 19 Is that a journal to which you make 2.0 reference? 21 Again, I think it's a journal that I Α. 22 receive. And my answer would be the same as I have 23 expressed regarding other journals. 24 Ο. So you think it's one that you receive and 25 regularly review?

[	64
1	A. I believe that it sounds like one of the
2	journals that I receive.
3	MR. UPCHURCH: Mr. Phillips, I need a brief
4	break when you come to a good stopping point.
5	MR. PHILLIPS: I should have told the doctor
6	that when we started, should you need a break, I will
7	be happy to give you one. Mr. Upchurch has baled us
8	all out, so we'll take a break now.
9	(Whereupon, a short recess was taken off the
10	record.)
11	BY MR. PHILLIPS:
12	Q. Would you locate the toxicology report from
13	Mississippi, please?
14	MR. EDWARDS: You say the toxicology report,
15	there are actually two from Mississippi. Which one?
16	MR. PHILLIPS: Just get them both.
17	THE WITNESS: Yes, I have that report.
18	BY MR. PHILLIPS:
19	Q. I'm looking specifically for page 3 of 5 on
20	the tox report for Mississippi, there's a reference
21	comment No. 5. Do you see that?
22	A. Yes, page 3 of 5, yes.
23	Q. Reference comment No. 5?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Would you read that, please?

A. "LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide) subclavian blood. LSD is a U.S. DEA Schedule I substance with no medical use. It is generally classified as a hallucinogen or psychodelic drug and may produce illusion, both auditory and visual. Physiological effects are primarily sympathomimetic, and may include madrases, hyperthermia, seizures, panic and paranoid reactions.

Flashback reactions are not uncommon in the experienced user. Effects may develop in as little as 15 minutes and generally last no more than eight hours but in rare cases may proceed or exceed 12 hours.

Blood concentrations of LSD between 4 and 6 ng/mL are usually seen one to two hours after the usual psychodelic dose; however, levels as high as 16 ng/mL have been reported.

Death due to the pharmacological effects of LSD is rare, with most of this occurring as a result of LSD-induced suicide and accidental trauma."

- Q. Do you agree with what you just read?
- A. Yes.

2.0

Q. You've made reference in your report to the fact that Troy Goode took LSD on July 18, 2015; correct?

63 Α. 1 Yes. 2 Ο. What impact did LSD have on Troy Goode? It caused him to be become hallucinogenic. 3 Α. 4 He was clearly hallucinating and suffering from the 5 effects of LSD. I think it's referred to 6 colloquially as a bad trip. 7 The erratic behavior that is described in Ο. 8 your report, is that the result of LSD? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. The reference in your report to his feeling 11 claustrophobiic and getting out of the car twice, 12 pacing in circles saying I don't know what to do, I 13 don't know what to do, is that all attributable to 14 his LSD ingestion? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Ο. Does marijuana in any way potentiate the effects of LSD? 17 18 Α. Not to my knowledge. Marijuana is 19 pharmacologically characterized as a mild 20 hallucinogen. I'm not aware of any references to any 21 kind of synergistic effect. I have not encountered 22 it myself in any of my cases. 23 It's an interesting question because, as 24 I've already said, marijuana has a mild

hallucinogenic effect. It is theoretically possible

25

## Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

that it could contribute a little bit, I just don't know of any study. I can't answer that in a definitive way.

- Q. Does marijuana produce a hallucinogenic effect?
- A. Well, I told you it's a mild hallucinogenic. I'm not aware, from what I know and hear and read about marijuana that it produces anything like what was manifested by Mr. Goode, not at all. I've never heard of anything like that among marijuana users.
- Q. In your report with reference to Mr. Goode's condition in the emergency room you say that he appeared to be extremely agitative and combative. Is that related to his LSD ingestion?
- A. I think it is, along with an extremely uncomfortable physical position of being hogtied over a prolonged period of time, of some difficulty in breathing easily. Primarily I think the effects are due to LSD, but I think definitely enhanced and aggravated by those physical circumstances.
- Q. You state in your report in the ER he was screaming uncontrollably and disrupting the entire department. Is that, too, related to LSD ingestion?
- A. My answer would be the same, primarily due to LSD but also due to the hogtied position, which

65 1 makes it difficult to breathe, to the overall 2 physical situation in which he found himself. 3 But basically and primarily due to LSD with those aggravating enhancing factors. 4 5 You state further he appeared floridly 6 psychotic. Is that, too, from his narcotic 7 ingestion? Α. 8 I think those things which could be 9 considered psychotic are primarily due to LSD. 10 Ο. He stated "I don't know how to explode". Ιs 11 that something you also attribute to his LSD 12 ingestion? 13 Well, it's a statement that he made as 14 reported to me. I think, again, my answer is the 15 same. It's all part of his reaction to LSD. part of the overall hallucinatory state in which he 16 17 found himself. 18 Ο. Were you aware that he had used LSD on at 19 least two prior occasions, one in 2008 and one in 20 2013? 21 Α. No, I don't think I know anything about past 22 experience. 23 Would that make any difference to any 24 conclusion you reach in the case? 25 Α. No. There's nothing of a lingering nature

66

at all; once it's over with LSD it's over. So no, that would be of no relevance to me.

- Q. Can LSD ingestion cause excited delirium?
- A. I have to start by telling you that I do not accept excited delirium as a scientific diagnosis, so therefore I can't answer that question.

But the second part of the answer is that if you take the effects of LSD producing these kinds of hallucinogenic delusional thoughts, expressions and physical actions, then they can lead to a state of great excitation.

I'm not aware, I'm trying to think of the people who do believe in such a diagnosis, whether they -- I can't speak for them because they related cocaine and stimulants. I can't answer that question for the reasons I've given.

- Q. What, does acronym NAME stand for?
- A. National Association of Medical Examiners.
  - Q. Doesn't that organization except excited delirium?
    - A. I believe they do.
    - Q. Are you a member of that organization?
  - A. Yes.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Isn't excited delirium accepted and discussed?

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

A. Yes, by many people, and rejected by others.

- Q. So it is accepted in the forensic pathology literature generally, isn't it?
- A. I can't tell you generally. I'm telling you that I'm aware that it has been accepted by some groups and by many individuals and by some people who have written books on it, and others do not accept it, it's been rejected with some very strong derogatory statements by various people, Canadian Medical Association, Royal Canadian Police, I think some of the European groups and so on.

But I am very much aware that it has been accepted by NAME and by other people who are experienced, competent forensic pathologists.

- Q. Does the forensic pathology literature recognize that LSD ingestion can cause excited delirium?
- A. That's exactly the question you asked me before. I gave my answer. And I'm not sure if the people who believe in excited delirium have related this to LSD. I don't know. I'm not telling you no. I'm telling you I don't know.

The cases that I've dealt with in which excited delirium has been proposed, expounded, they have related almost always to people who have had

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

cocaine or amphetamine or the central nervous system stimulants. I just can't think offhand whether they have related it to hallucinogenic compounds. I'm not saying they haven't, but I don't remember.

All the references that I have encountered have been to cocaine, amphetamines, MDMA, Xtasy, those kinds of drugs. But it may well be that others have related it to LSD, I just don't know.

- Q. Can LSD ingestion cause a cardiac arrhythmia?
- A. Well, yes, we see it in this case, it produced supraventricular tachycardia, which is an arrhythmia. That's the kind of arrhythmia I think that has been referred to by people writing about LSD.
- Q. Can LSD injection produce a cardiac arrhythmia that can lead to death?
- A. No, because, to get to the heart of the matter, the reports show somewhere I've seen from 9 to 11 percent of Americans have ingested LSD one or more times.

Using the higher number, some people have estimated as many as 31 million Americans have used LSD, and there are just no deaths, a couple have been reported, it's quite arguable in the literature

2.

2.3

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

whether they were scientifically shown to have been attributed.

That's why I said a handful or so, not to quibble, one or two or three or four, literally a handful; and many authors have said none, others say maybe the one case or so on.

I have never seen LSD listed in any of the autopsy reports, about 40,000, rough estimate, that I have seen death certificates and/or autopsy reports nor have I ever listed it myself, and I've already told you what is set forth in the literature.

So the answer, therefore, to your question of a fatal cardiac arrhythmia is no, because that indeed would be the mechanism of death were it to occur as a result of LSD from cardiac arrhythmia.

And I just have not experienced that.

- Q. Can LSD indirectly lead to death?
- A. Indirectly, cases of people committing suicide or being killed accidently under the influence of LSD, I can understand that, and I'm aware of some reported cases.

In fact, gee, I remember a long time ago the U.S. government had somebody they were experimenting on who jumped out of a building or so on in New York City. So the answer indirectly, yes.

2.0

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

- Q. In your report of December 5, 2016 you list a couple of questions that you answer. The first is on page 4 and the second is on the top of page 5. Did somebody suggest these questions to you?
- A. No. These are questions that I pose to myself and respond based on what I think is the essence of the matter as it relates to me.
- Q. So nobody raised with you concern about LSD use before you prepared your report?
- A. Oh, I'm sure the question had been raised in the discussion with Mr. Edwards. It was no secret. I didn't come up with something that hadn't been thought of.

But the answer to your question is, I mean, obviously it was a question on Mr. Edwards' mind. But did he state that question in that form to me?

No. These are my words.

Obviously, I knew that Mr. Edwards would like to know and would need to know what my thoughts were in terms of LSD and Mr. Goode's death.

- Q. Was it also made clear to you that he was interested in your opinion about whether positional asphyxia played a role?
- A. Yes, sure. We had talked about that. By that time I had the information about the hogtied

position.

So once again, my answer is exactly the same, the question is in my words, the objective and the purpose of the question and the answer thereto is something that I obviously recognized to be the essence of the case, of course.

- Q. You made reference earlier to some difficulty breathing that Mr. Goode had?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you point me to anything in the medical record at Baptist Hospital that would indicate he was having difficulty breathing?
- A. Well, yes, the respiratory rate as I recall rose, the blood pressure dropped -- I mean, the blood pressure first it rose and then it dropped. The respiratory rate raised. And the oxygen level dropped to about 90 percent.

So that is a clear manifestation of some respiratory difficulty. 90 percent is not acceptable. Healthy, normal guy, I'm sure Mr. Goode walking around before all of this happened he would have had a much higher oxygen level. So that is the most specific diagnostic reflection of respiratory compromise.

Q. Did you see any assessment done by anybody

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

in the emergency department who actually saw Mr. Goode where they indicated he was having trouble breathing?

A. I don't recall a specific statement by -they did not assess under pulmonary, chest, "too
combative to assess fully". And pulmonary/chest,
there's no comment there at all.

The respiratory rate was 24. The oxygen level is 90 percent, which I have already referred to. So do I see a statement about respiratory difficulty? No, they did not listen with a stethoscope, they did not do an auscultation test, they said that they were unable to do that.

Q. But wouldn't a trained health care professional observing a patient be able to discern difficulty breathing without putting a stethoscope on the chest?

MR. EDWARDS: Object to the form.

THE WITNESS: The answer is yes, but a trained health care professional person would do a lot of other things, too, like somebody is in your hospital and he's in a hogtied position and you're seeing these laboratory changes is to remove him from the hogtied position.

I'm not trying to be sarcastic or clever

73 1 here. What I'm saying is in answer to your guestion, 2 what would trained hospital personnel do, again, trained hospital personnel, you don't see a lot of 3 4 the injuries that were found by the pathologist in 5 Mississippi and by me that are reflected in the 6 hospital record. 7 So I'm not here to make comments on any 8 aspect of the case that might deal with medical 9 malpractice, but I'm pointing out when you ask me in this case about observations and comments by health 10 care professionals, that's part of my answer, the 11 12 record speaks for itself, what they saw and what they 13 stated and what they did not comment upon or observe. 14 So I don't know what to tell you. 15 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 16 Are you not in this case offering any 17 opinions on the standard of care, are you? 18 Α. No, I am not. 19 Q. And your practice doesn't include seeing 20 living patients, does it? 21 Α. No. 22 Ο. And it doesn't include assessing living 23 patients, does it? 24 Α. It doesn't include what? 25 Ο. Assessing living patients.

A. Assessing, no.

Q. Did you mention in your report of December 5, 2016 the important things that you saw in the medical records?

A. No, I do not believe. Let me see. No, the only comment of a tangential nature is on page 3, in that 8:49 to 9:22 block where I state Troy was in a hospital room with police, still in a hogtied position, and I give the source from the police incident report. Then I say police, not medical personnel, advised medical personnel that Troy was no longer breathing.

So that's the only reference that I see to anything in my report about the hospital. As I've said, in answer to your question today and I'm sure in my mind at that time I was not approaching this as I would do in a report dealing with medical malpractice.

One thing, sir, I just noticed on that page 3 also up above, I do say that triage reflected oxygen saturation of 90 percent and respiration of 24, so that is a reference to the hospital record.

Q. You noted that Mr. Goode was said to be screaming and yelling while in the emergency department; right?

A. Yes.

Q. Isn't that some indication of ability to breathe and ventilate?

A. No. If I understand your question, as a matter of fact the opposite might be true. When you're having difficulty in breathing, that is one of the most -- well, that is the most fundamental voluntary/involuntary physiological phenomenon, the need to breathe; the panic that ensues when you are having a compromise of oxygen.

And so then the yelling, the exhortations are likely to be greater than, for example, if you're having an experience with some pain or some other kind of distress.

The inability to breathe is the most frightening, horrific situation that a human being finds himself in, that an animal finds itself in, but we'll talk about human beings.

So in that situation it is well known in these cases of the combativeness, of the yelling and the screaming, it's just a terrible situation in which you are not able to breathe properly.

- Q. But you have to have air in your lungs to be able to yell and scream, don't you, doctor?
  - A. Absolutely, but at no --

# Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

Q. To do that repeatedly indicates you're able to fill your lungs with oxygen, yell and scream, fill your lungs with oxygen, yell and scream; right?

A. I would accept the statement except when you say fill. To take in some oxygen and to breathe and be able to verbalize, my answer is yes. But that doesn't mean that you're filling, that you're removing the CO2 and taking in oxygen in the normal fashion. It just means, sure, and I at no time ever have I thought or commented or believe that his mouth and nose were closed and that he was unable to do any breathing.

It's a matter of the compromised nature of the normal respiratory physiological function, not a matter of physical or mechanical asphyxiation blocking the airway.

- Q. Did you see in the medical record any reference to any abnormal color in this patient before he coded?
- A. No, I do not recall any reference to any kind of discoloration.
- Q. Is it your conclusion that Mr. Goode died of a cardiac event?
- A. Yes. It's my conclusion that he died as a result -- everybody dies when the heart stops

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

beating. I believe that he died as a result of cardiorespiratory failure.

I believe that he died as a result of compromise of normal breathing process as a result of his prolonged hogtied position anywhere from an hour and 20 to an hour and 30 minutes as I calculate the numbers, a portion of which also included even I think five circular straps over his body, too, in the EMS vehicle.

So I believe that that would be the final cause of death, cardiorespiratory failure brought about by respiratory compromise, then we see evidence of cardiac effect with the supraventricular tachycardia noted a couple of times and then reflected on a portion of ECG strip, although I don't read ECG strips, but just taking their interpretation of what I understand there's a limited ECG reading.

So that's the answer to your question, that to me is the cause of death here. This was an otherwise healthy individual with no problems other than a chronic asthmatic condition, which I understand was reported, I've been told that Mrs. Goode did mention that to the police, that her husband had asthma, although as you have asked me, I cannot myself state that as an anatomical diagnosis

based upon my autopsy.

But otherwise, this is a healthy man. And I've given you my thoughts on LSD and on excited delirium based upon my experience dealing with these kinds of matters of positional asphyxiation, this is my opinion which I express with a reasonable degree of medical forensic scientific certainty.

- Q. You don't interpret EKGs, do you?
- A. I prefer the English, ECG.
- Q. Sorry.
- A. That's okay. No, I've already said that, no, I don't interpret them. I already volunteered that. I just refer to the interpretation by somebody who read that.
- Q. Mr. Goode's death is also consistent with excited delirium leading to a cardiac arrhythmia, isn't it?
- A. No, it is not. So again, I'll preface my response by saying that I don't accept excited delirium as a scientifically documented diagnosis. But let's take it hypothetically.

No, number one, you do not have something that is found in these cases of hyperthermia; number two, most, not 100 percent, but almost all of these cases involve people who have been -- who have taken

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

a central nervous system stimulant, cocaine most frequently, amphetamine, methamphetamine, MDMA, Xtasy and so on, sometimes with high levels of alcohol. We don't have that.

And then also the cases that I've dealt with, they have been cases in which somebody placed in the -- somebody who dies as a result of what others accept as excited delirium, and these have always interestingly been police-related deaths in my experience somehow, it doesn't seem to happen with other people, only when they have an altercation with a policeman, that they die then and there. They don't die an hour and a half later.

So for those reasons, just dealing hypothetically, again, that if this were to be considered as excited delirium, my response is as I've given it, no hyperthermia, no precipitating pharmacological agent, and the delayed death, I do not believe this would meet the criteria of excited delirium for those who believe in excited delirium.

- Q. Do you see any symptoms that Mr. Goode had that are consistent with excited delirium?
- A. Yes, for those who believe in excited delirium; combativeness, excitation, screaming, yelling, yes, those are things that are reported in

such cases.

- Q. Have you ever concluded that any person's death was related to excited delirium?
- A. No, because I do not believe in that diagnosis.
- Q. There was no weight on Mr. Goode's back while he was in the emergency department, was there?
  - A. No, none that I saw reported.
- Q. And in the emergency department he was not strapped down; right?
  - A. He was not.
- Q. Can one have positional asphyxia by being restrained in some manner other than prone maximal restraint?
- A. Prone maximal restraint. Yes, not all cases involve a total hogtied position. Some have a partial binding, not necessarily complete, wrist to wrist or ankle to ankle. And also in many -- some, many, I don't know the percentage breakdown, but in many cases, probably -- well, in many of the cases, too, you have additional involvement of one or more people pressing down on the victim's back, neck, back, you have that as an additional component in many such cases.
  - O. That doesn't exist here?

A. Not to my knowledge.

- Q. Have you ever evaluated a case where there was a concern about positional asphyxia and concluded that the patient did not die of positional asphyxia?
- A. I don't know. The answer is, I can't give you a specific case. I may have, but I cannot refer to a specific case.
- Q. How long does it normally take for a patient to asphyxiate?
- A. Oh, that will vary greatly. The answer is, total cessation for whatever reason of oxygen, we're talking about four to six minutes of oxygen reservoir in the brain, you may wind up with some damage, but that's usually the figures that people give.

It can vary. Some people in frigid conditions, even in ice water, can last longer. Forget the people who train for this, pearl divers, some of them are absolutely incredible.

But the average person, you know, we talk about four to six minutes. Now, that's total, total blockage in whatever fashion, you're smothered by a landslide, I had some of those cases not a couple weeks or so ago, young man just working with his father in a ditch and everything just came down upon him.

Alpha Reporting Corporation

So if you have partial compromise, it will take longer. Well, look at a carbon monoxide case for example, it may take a long time before you die, before you reach a level in which the oxygen supply is just inadequate for your body's needs.

So it varies. There's all kinds of situations. You have to deal with each one based upon the circumstances of that case.

Q. We talked earlier about the American Journal of Forensic Pathology of which you have served on the editorial board. I want to ask you about a particular article which appeared in Volume 19, September 1998, on pages 201 through 205.

The title of the article is Reexamination of Custody Restraint Position in Positional Asphyxia.

Let me pass you a copy here so you can look at what I'm talking about.

Look at the last sentence of the first paragraph under the abstract on page 1. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

- Q. Would you read that last sentence, please?
- A. "We conclude that the hogtied restraint position by itself does not cause respiratory compromise to the point of asphyxiation and that

other factors are responsible for the sudden death of individuals placed in this position."

- Q. Do you agree with that statement?
- A. No.

- Q. Is that statement inconsistent with the opinion you've reached in this case?
- A. Yes, except for the last part, by the way. The last part is actually consistent when they see sudden deaths. Now, of course they don't give a temporal definition or parameters, but that's an interesting comment and consistent with what I said a little while ago about excited delirium, the suddenness of such a case.

But taking the overall statement otherwise, yes, I disagree. And this gets to what we talked about an hour or two ago, whenever, about journals and articles. I definitely disagree with this statement.

- Q. Your position is that the maximum restraint position causes respiratory compromise; right?
  - A. Yes, indeed.
- Q. And that's what this study expressly rejected; right?
- A. That's correct. They disagree, and evidently their findings and statements have not been

84 1 accepted either by the overwhelming majority of federal, state and local police agencies in the 2 3 United States of America that specifically instruct 4 their police officers not to place somebody in a 5 hogtied position and certainly not to keep them in 6 that position for any period of time. 7 So evidently this has not been accepted by a 8 lot of other people, too, besides me. 9 MR. EDWARDS: Was this a study funded by the San Diego Police Department? 10 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 11 12 Ο. Is this a study that is peer-reviewed, doctor? 13 14 Α. I would imagine. I would believe that the 15 article published in this journal had been 16 peer-reviewed, yes. 17 What does that mean if it's been 18 peer-reviewed? 19 Α. It means that two or more, but usually two, 20 members of the editorial board -- well, not 21 necessarily limited to the editorial board, but two 22 other people, either on the editorial board or people 2.3 in the same field of medicine or whatever, have 24 looked at the article and expressed their opinions. 25 Look at page 7, the conclusions section. Q.

A. Yes.

- Q. Read the last sentence, please.
- A. "Although restraints in general, in general, increase the psychological and physiologic stress on the individual, no evidence suggests that body position alone causes hypoventilation, respiratory compromise, or positional asphyxia in the hogtied custody restraint position."
  - Q. Do you agree with that statement?
- A. Absolutely not. I myself have had cases in which, very famous case around here, Johnny Gamut, 33-year-old guy, cases of healthy people with no disease at all, and I mean, no, I absolutely do not agree with this statement and this -- well, I won't repeat myself about all the other people and organizations and groups, including law enforcement with very specific guidelines and instructions that have been in place for years.

In fact, it's now 2017, these guidelines, these instructions, most of them have now been adopted for now about a decade, it varies greatly. But this is not something that is brand new on the table.

Q. This is a conclusion published by a well recognized journal in your field that's

86 peer-reviewed, based upon research that's been done? 1 2 Yes, that's what the authors state. 3 Ο. So this is a position that reasonable forensic pathologists can take; right, based upon 4 5 this research? 6 I can't speak for anybody else. already answered you that I am well aware that many 7 8 of my colleagues accept the phenomenon of excited 9 delirium. I recognize that and --10 Ο. This has nothing to do with excited 11 delirium. This has --12 Α. In a hoptied position. 13 Ο. -- to do with that restrain causes 14 respiratory compromise? 15 I'm sorry. That, I can't comment on. 16 sorry, I was jumping to excited delirium. 17 I don't know, when you say my colleagues, 18 may I see that again? I can't speak for all forensic 19 pathologists. I cannot answer your question. 20 think most forensic pathologists do believe that a 21 hogtied position could lead to death. That is my 22 belief. Can I cite you a source? Have I conducted a 23 survey? No, I have not. 24 But I think that most of my forensic 25 pathologists nowadays if they're confronted and given

the information about a prolonged hogtied position that they would accept it. But I can't give you an article to refer to.

- Q. This is a conclusion published in a peer-reviewed forensic pathology journal?
- A. Yes. I do not recognize -- you'll see these are emergency room physicians. So they're speaking for themselves. My only comment is these are not by forensic pathologists. These are by emergency room physicians. Big difference.
- Q. Given the fact that it's published in a forensic pathology journal indicates that peer reviewers reviewed it, thought it valid and accurate and worthy of publication; true?
  - A. Well --
- O. Is that true?
- 17 | A. Well --

- Q. Can you answer my question before you explain?
- A. I'm going to answer. I'm going to give you the answer. You read something, and as a reviewer, validity based upon what they represented doesn't mean that you yourself believe that, but you believe it is something that has been validly analyzed by the authors and that it has a right, so to speak, of

88 1 being published. 2 I'm not equivocating on this. I'm just 3 saying that you don't reject an article as an editorial board or other reviewer because you 4 5 disagree with the conclusions. You review it to see 6 does it have sufficient scholarliness, is it 7 sufficiently and properly -- and the answer is yes, they did review it and whoever it was and they 8 9 concluded that it was worthy of publication. 10 what it connotes. 11 And then as you are aware, in the legal 12 journals, let alone the lay public, that's where 13 letters to the editor come in from people who 14 disagree. 15 MR. PHILLIPS: Let's mark this article as 16 the next exhibit. (Deposition Exhibit No. 5 was marked for 17 18 identification.) 19 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 2.0 Q. I want to show you an article from the 21 Journal of Forensic Scientists 2007, Volume 2, No. 1. 22 This is, again, a journal for which you have served as an editor or on the editorial board; correct? 23 24 Yes. I don't believe I was an editor, but 25 on the editorial board, yes.

89 1 Q. This is an article entitled Ventilatory and 2 Metabolic Demands During Aggressive Physical Restraint in Healthy Adults; right? 3 Α. Yes. 4 5 Ο. The last sentence in the second paragraph on the left says what? 6 7 Α. "However, a recent study reported that, 8 although PMRP alone -- where am I? Sorry. I lost my 9 place. Let me start again. 10 "However, a recent study reported that, although PMRP by itself resulted in a small, 11 12 restrictive ventilatory pattern compared with seated 13 measurements, there is no evidence of 14 hypoventilation, hypercapnia or hypoxemia." 15 Do you agree with that statement? Ο. 16 Α. No. 17 Q. PMRP is defined early in the article as prone maximal restraint position? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 Q. And that's the position that Troy Goode was 21 in? 22 Α. Yes. 23 So this article says, it's referring to a Ο. 24 recent study that shows no evidence of 25 hypoventilation, hypercapnia or hypoxemia; right?

1.3

2.0

2.2

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

A. That's correct, with healthy adults in an investigative setting, yes, that's correct. Not exactly what you have in a setting involving police and nor does it address the question of time, such as we have in this case.

In fact, they talk about sudden death. If you look on page 173 under discussion, the first sentence again, although sudden death has occurred in individuals placed in the PMRP, on and on and on.

So once again we have the reference to the temporal component of so-called -- well, to these kinds of deaths. We see the use of the word sudden, even back on page 171 the right-hand side, the second sentence I see cases of sudden death of restrained individuals often involve those who continue to struggle after being restrained.

Q. Let me direct you back to page 173. You started to read a sentence but you didn't complete it. Let's complete it. It's on the right-hand column under discussion, "although sudden death has occurred in individuals placed in PMRP, the cause of death and whether body position was a factor remain controversial".

That's what the complete sentence says' right?

91 1 Α. Yes. 2 Do you agree with that, that that is a controversial topic? 3 Do I agree that it's controversial? Yes, I 4 Α. would have to agree that it's controversial, yes. 5 6 And on page 171 at the bottom there's a reference to a copyright by the American Academy of 7 Forensic Scientists. Do you see that? 8 Α. 9 Yes. Is that the organization that publishes the 10 Ο. Journal of Forensic Science? 11 12 Α. Yes. Are you a member of that organization? 13 Ο. 14 Α. Yes. And have served on its editorial board? 15 Q. 16 Α. Yes. Page 173 in the right-hand column, "prior 17 Q. studies in healthy subjects have found no evidence of 1.8 significant hypoventilation when subjects were placed 19 in PMRP". 2.0 21 Did I read at that correctly? 22 Α. Yes. Do you agree with that statement? 23 Ο. 24 Well, do I agree? I don't believe that Α. they're telling a lie. I believe that their study --25

do I believe that it is a comparable situation? No. But I'm not suggesting that they made this up.

- Q. You agree that there have been prior studies showing what they reference?
- A. Well, yes. In fact, you just showed me a prior study some minutes ago. Yes, I agree that there have been such studies.
- Q. And then it continues on 173, "our results in this study appear to support these findings". Right?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. So this is yet another study consistent with prior studies that show no evidence of significant hypoventilation when subjects are in prone maximum restraint position; correct?
- A. Yes, that is correct. What seems to be absent here, and I haven't had a chance to read the article, what seems to be absent here is the alternative explanation for the death.

I don't see anything talking about myocardial infarction, atherosclerosis of the coronary arteries, cerebral vascular accident, cerebral hemorrhage. I don't see anything like that. So they don't tell me how these people died.

Q. Look on page 175, the concluding sentence,

if you would, please. Actually the next to the last concluding sentence, left-hand column.

A. Yes.

Q. "Based on these observations in healthy subjects, we conclude that PMRP in prone positioning with moderate weight force on the back do not in and of themselves restrict metabolic or ventilatory demands to any clinically important degree. As such, factors other than isolated ventilatory failure should be considered when evaluating deaths occurring in the setting of restraint in the field."

Did I read that correctly?

- A. Yes, you read it correctly and --
- Q. Do you agree?
- A. No. My answer is the same as before. This is interesting that these authors don't tell us what the other things are that should be considered. I would love to know then what causes the death of a 26- or a 33-year-old person in good health with no, no, pathological processes found at autopsy at all.

I would love to know then, tell me, what did they die from? Tell me, what did they die from? Was it a visitation from God? What did they die from?

And I have not seen that in this article, I have not seen it anywhere in all of these cases of

excited delirium or the negated reports of people who have died while in a hogtied position.

They never tell me, gee, what caused the death. You die from something. And you usually die from cardiac arrhythmia when it happens like that of a sudden nature. That's the only thing that can cause sudden death. Forget about cyanide or strychnine or some poison like that.

The only thing that causes death is something that causes your heart to beat irregularly and then you set into motion a whole chain of events in which the brain is deprived of oxygen and then the

brain controlling the lungs and heart doesn't do its

job and the cycle worsens and that's it very fast, as

15 quickly as it takes me to explain it.

But that's how you die. And there's no other way that you die. That's how you die. And tell me, tell me, gentlemen, tell me what did these people die from.

Q. May I have the article, please. It will be Exhibit No. 6.

(Deposition Exhibit No. 6 was marked for identification.)

24 BY MR. PHILLIPS:

Q. I'll show you an article now, doctor, from

the Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine published in 2013. The title of this article is The Effect of the Prone Maximal Restraint Position With and Without Weight Force on Cardiac Output and Other Hemodynamic Measures; correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. This is yet another publication in the literature in the field of forensic pathology; right?
- A. Yes. Again, submitted by emergency room physicians.
- Q. But peer-reviewed, all of these articles that we've looked at are peer-reviewed, aren't they?
  - A. Yes, I believe so.
- Q. And accepted for publication in forensic pathology journals?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Look on page 993.
- A. Okay.
  - Q. Right-hand column, first full paragraph, "Previously, it had been postulated that the hogtie, hobble or the PMR-O position placed individuals at risk for asphyxiation from ventilatory compromise from so-called positional asphyxia. However, studies investigating the position have found that while PMR, and even just the prone position itself, results in a

# Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

small restrictive pattern on pulmonary function testing, there are no studies indicating that the position leads to hypoventilation or hypoxia, and multiple studies indicating that there is no effect upon oxygenation."

Did I read it correctly?

A. Yes.

- Q. Do you agree with that statement?
- A. No. I accept the statement from the authors and referring to studies. Do I believe in what the statement sets forth? No.
- Q. Yes, sir. That's a fair distinction. Let me refine my question a bit.

You do not dispute that there have been multiple studies indicating that there's no effect of the prone maximal restraint position upon oxygenation, you don't dispute that statement?

- A. Right, I don't know the number, but no, I don't dispute it. You've already shown several of these today.
- Q. And those findings of those multiple studies that we just referenced there in those two sentences, that's contrary to your opinion in this case; right?
  - A. Yes, that's right.
  - Q. This would be contrary to the basis of the

97 1 opinion you hold in this case, wouldn't it? 2 Α. Well, yes, except that I must point out to 3 have some volunteers engage in an experimental 4 situation, to be conducted right here in this room 5 right now is an awful lot different from the 6 psychological emotional state that we have with 7 Mr. Goode and in other cases in which I, myself, have 8 done autopsies where it was clear that the person 9 died as a result of having been placed in that 10 position. 11 Ο. Look at page 994, please, in the right 12 column. It's the paragraph just above -- it's on the 13 right. 14 Wait a minute. Α. 15 Ο. 994. 16 Α. I have it. 17 It's the paragraph beginning "in summary". Ο. 18 Α. Yes, I see it. 19 Ο. It says, "In summary, our findings do not 20 support the contention that PMR with or without 21 weight force of up to 100 pounds results in a 22 decrement in CO, carbon dioxide, sufficient to cause an inherent risk of cardiovascular collapse". 23 24 Is that what it says?

A. Yes, that's what it says. By the way, they

have it CO, they probably mean CO -- anyway, just let it be, I'm not going to correct them editorially, but something's wrong. Anyway, I understand what they're saying. Yeah, go ahead.

Q. The last sentence of that paragraph -- actually, the next sentence says, "These findings are consistent with field case reports in which similar sudden deaths occurred in non-prone and non-PMR positions".

Did I read that correctly?

- A. Wait a minute. I kind of lost you. One second. Yes, that's right.
- Q. Next sentence, "These findings are also consistent with a recent large prospective epidemiological study of police use of force in which prone position was not found to be associated with sudden death".

Did I read that correctly?

A. Yes.

- Q. And you don't dispute that there was a large prospective epidemiologic study making that finding, do you?
- A. No, if they cite it, I'm not aware of it, but they give you the reference. I accept the correctness.

Q. Then the last sentence of that particular paragraph, "as such, it appears another cause of cardiovascular collapse is more likely in these types than decreased CO secondary to prone position with weight force".

Did I read that correctly?

A. Yes.

2.

2.2

Q. Conclusions at the bottom of the page,
"Cardiac output is not significantly affected by the
PMR compared with the prone or supine positions, with
without application of 50 to 100 pounds of weight
force to the back".

Did I read that correctly?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. You don't dispute that that's the conclusion and finding of this research that's published in this particular forensic journal, do you?
- A. That's right. Once again I'm looking for the explanation for the people who died. They don't tell that.

The other thing is, you can do this with me at my age right now, the oldest person in the room, lying down on the ground and put 100 pounds of weight, let the young lady, our stenographer, she doesn't weigh much more than that, sit on my back,

100 and I assure you I will not have a problem breathing. 1 2 It's a hell of a lot different than four or five cops around there that have me in the hogtied 3 4 position. I can just imagine the language and the 5 situation between the victim and the police. A little bit different. 6 7 That's the problem with all of these 8 studies. Let's have a controlled study, Joe, you lie 9 on the ground, Susan, lie on the ground, and we put 10 some weight on you and so on. Boy, that is 11 different, day and night. 12 MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark this article as 13 the next exhibit. 14 (Deposition Exhibit No. 7 was marked for 15 identification.) BY MR. PHILLIPS: 16 17 We made reference earlier to Dr. Vincent 18 DiMaio and his book on forensic pathology. Do you recognize this as the cover page from that book? 19 20 Α. No. See, I don't have this book because I 21 see a co-author Suzanna Dana. No, I don't have this 22 book. I think I have a textbook by Dr. DiMaio, but this one I do not have. 23 24 On page 169, I'm sorry, I don't have an 25 extra copy of this, letter D says, "research by Chan,

101 1 et al. determined that the original experiments were 2 He found that while placing an individual in error. face down in the hogtied position following strenuous 3 4 exercise, e.g. a struggle, did produce restrictive 5 pulmonary functioning as measured by pulmonary 6 These results were not clinically function test. 7 relevant. There was no evidence of hypoxia". 8 Is that what letter D says. 9 Α. Yes, I'm sure you read it. Yes, that's what 10 it says. 11 Q. Do you agree with Dr. DiMaio's conclusion 12 there? 13 Α. Well, again, I'm accepting that he is 14 quoting the article by Chan, et al. correctly. Do I 15 agree with the findings? No, I do not. 16 Then letter E on page 169 says, "Subsequent 17 testing in which weights were applied to the thorax 18 also did not produce clinically relevant decreases in pulmonary functioning. Thus, there is no proof that 19 20 ordinary force placed on an individual by kneeling on 21 them or lying across their body compromises respiration". 22 23 Did I read that correctly? 24 Α. Yes, I'm sure you did. My comment is the

same. Again, my other comments are also the same;

```
102
 1
     what causes the death and how come all of the
 2
     recognizable police agencies in the country,
 3
     including the International Association of Police
 4
     Chiefs, have issued orders not to place somebody in a
 5
     hogtied position?
 6
              MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark the DiMaio
 7
     excerpts as the next exhibit.
 8
              (Deposition Exhibit No. 8 was marked for
 9
     identification.)
10
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
11
         Q.
              Would you agree, doctor, that there is a
     significant body of medical literature that disagrees
12
13
     with the conclusions that you've reached in this
14
     case?
15
              MR. EDWARDS: Objection; asked and answered.
16
              THE WITNESS:
                            Yes.
17
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
18
         Ο.
              When you undertook your analysis of this
     case, did you make any survey of the scientific
19
20
     literature to see what the research, testing and
21
     publications had shown regarding whether positional
22
     asphyxia causes the problems that you attribute to
23
     it?
24
              I did not conduct a specific extensive
25
     research because I was then, as I am today, familiar
```

1.4

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

with these positions, not every one of the papers
that you have presented to me, but I've been long
aware of such findings. So I was well aware of that.
I did not have to conduct any research to know that
there are people who have other opinions.

- Q. What current positions or jobs do you hold?
- A. Well, I'm an independent person. I am a forensic pathologist. I do autopsies for district attorneys and coroners in four surrounding counties here in southwestern Pennsylvania, but I'm an independent contractor, I'm not on their payroll. I get paid for the work that I do.

I get a small, they give it nominally to the adjunct professors at the Duquesne University School of Law, to cover parking, I don't know, \$2,200, \$2,500. I think that's the only payment that I receive from anybody.

All the other work involves payment that I receive from coroners, district attorneys, private families for whom I do autopsies, like I did yesterday and will be doing again this afternoon, and for my consultations with attorneys in all kinds of cases, civil and criminal. So that's where my income comes from.

Q. Do you currently hold any position with any

medical school?

A. Yes. I'm an adjunct professor of pathology, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, and I'm -- no, sorry. Clinical professor of pathology, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine; adjunct professor of epidemiology, Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh.

Then I have several other faculty positions, but those are the ones that relate to -- well, no, there's another one at Carlow University, I'm a distinguished professor of pathology. I don't know if you said medical schools. That's not a medical school, it's a university, Carlow, distinguished professor of pathology at Carlow University.

I have three faculty appointments at Duquesne University, but they're not in pathology; they're law, health sciences and pharmacology toxicology.

- Q. We walked through these various articles earlier in the case. My question to you at this point is as follows: Can you cite to me any published peer-reviewed article that supports your position and conclusion in this case?
- A. I have no articles that I could cite to you at this time. I believe there are, if Mr. Edwards

# Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

were to find it necessary, I would look for those. As we sit here today I cannot cite you an article, but I know that there are such articles and such statements.

In fact, that of course is the very foundation that is the predicate upon which law enforcement agencies all over the country, at the federal, state and local levels, have adopted the policies that they have.

- Q. You read with me through the articles that we addressed that there was at one time some consideration that the prone maximal restraint position led to the problems that you described, but subsequent testing and research disproved that theory. You read that with me, didn't you?
- A. I read what the authors say, and I disagree with that. Here again, if that were to be true, how come there has not been any retraction, any recision, indeed any modification whatsoever of all of the promulgated guidelines to which I have referred several times here today? It evidently has not reached those levels of law enforcement.
- Q. Is there a difference between a medical examiner and a coroner?
  - A. Well, the difference is in most places the

Alpha Reporting Corporation

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

106 coroner -- by definition the coroner as traditionally acknowledged doesn't have to be a forensic pathologist. Medical examiners by definition in this country are to be forensic pathologists. So those are the differences. Most coroner systems involve election, and I think all medical examiner positions involve appointments by some governmental agency. Ο. Do you currently hold the position of coroner anywhere? Α. No. When have you last held such a position? Ο. Α. January '06. Ο. What is the last coroner position that you held? That's the last coroner position. I am the forensic pathologist for these four coroners, I have been for a couple of other coroners, too. But at the present time for these four coroners, I am their sole forensic pathologist. Q. But the last coroner position you held would have been for Allegheny County? Α. Yes. How did it come to be that you stopped being the coroner of Allegheny County?

A. They adopted a medical examiner system by election in November of '05. And then I was appointed the medical examiner and resigned that month, in January of '06.

Q. Why did you resign?

A. If you want to get into on the record, you're going to pay for the next two hours. You open up that door, that's fine. I love to talk about it. I love to talk about it. But you're not going to open up the door and close it. I'm going to make this very clear that I know you cannot talk about this. If you want to talk about, we're going to do it, sir. I'm going to go into great detail.

I resigned because the federal government indicted me for 84 felony counts. And I'm going to go through every single point, okay, in which finally the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals, three Republicans, said that the judge who handled the case had to be removed because he was biased. And it was turned over to another federal judge who ripped the U.S. Attorney's office apart, and all the charges were dropped completely in June of 2009.

Do you want to walk with me on the streets of Pittsburgh and see what the people of Pittsburgh think about me? Do you want to go down that road,

sir, fine, we're going to go down that road politically.

2.

I know and you know that you cannot bring this up in a court of law. I think it is despicable for you to open up this door. I thought you would behave like a gentleman. You have shown me that in truth you are not. You're like so many other defense attorneys, anything goes, anything goes at all.

It doesn't go here. You're in my territory. You're in my room. So you want to come up with this stuff, fine, we're going to deal with it. We'll go through whatever you want. We'll talk about the U.S. attorney who is so disagreed that she left Pittsburgh and it took her four years to get a job. We're going to talk about it all. Do you want to talk about, let's talk about. Don't play games with me.

- Q. Did you ever practice as a lawyer?
- A. Once I was in a court co-counsel, once I took a deposition, and once I took a case pro bono from the federal court to plead somebody guilty.

I was a member of a law firm, Wecht Law

Firm, as a listed member, of counsel. Practicing are
the three things that I have mentioned, and I think

I've done a few little things for people as friends,

maybe writing a will or so on. But no, I haven't

109 1 practiced as a lawyer. I just have not had the time. 2 I have kept up my legal license and have it to this 3 day. 4 Ο. Have you ever represented either party to a 5 civil case as the lawyer yourself? 6 Α. No. 7 Ο. How about in a criminal case? 8 Α. No. 9 Ο. Your CV reflects that you are a member of 10 the Association of Trial Lawyers of America; is that 11 right? 12 Α. I have been. It's been a long time, I think 13 it's 10, 15, 20 years since I was a member, but I had 14 been a member for many years. 15 Do you know that to be an organization comprised of plaintiff's attorneys? 16 17 Α. Yes. 18 And you also were a member of the Medical 19 Malpractice Committee of the American Association of 20 Trial Lawyers of America? 21 I don't remember. If I was, I was. That is 22 a committee, I don't recall ever being in the 23 committee meetings. But if it's so listed, I was. 24 Q. It is, it's listed on your CV. 25 Were you a member of the Pennsylvania Trial

Lawyers Association?

A. Yes.

- Q. Is that an organization comprised of predominantly plaintiff's lawyers?
- A. Yes. And I haven't been a member of that either -- I guess I dropped out of all of those about the same time. It should be reflected in my CV. I set it forth in the CV that I was a member of those organizations, but I know I'm safe in saying ten years, I'm pretty certain it would be 15 to 20 years.
- Q. You're aware, aren't you, doctor, that there are professional associations for defense attorneys, civil defense attorneys?
- A. Yes. And I was a member of the American Association of Hospital Attorneys, too, which is a defense organization, as I recall, for some years and haven't been a member of that organization for a long time. But yes, I know that there are defense organizations.
- Q. Have you been to any seminars put on by the American Association of Trial Lawyers as it pertains to expert witnesses and how to be an expert witness?
- A. Yes, I was. Back then in those years with ATLA, yes, I did attend and speak at several ATLA meetings way back in the '70s and '80s, maybe into

111 1 the '90s. Yes, I did speak at several of those. 2 0. Have you ever attended any other seminars or 3 programs on how to be an expert witness in a medical 4 case? 5 Α. I haven't attended. Well, I've spoken at 6 several meetings. I don't know what the exact titles 7 were, and I've written about being an expert witness 8 and what to expect several times. Again, they're all 9 listed in my CV. 10 Ο. Have you ever been convicted of any crime? 11 Α. No. 12 Ο. Have you ever pled quilty to any crime? 13 Α. No. 14 Ο. Have you ever had any adverse action taken 15 on your medical license? 16 Α. No. 17 Q. Have you ever had a complaint filed against 18 you by any medical board, any licensing board? 19 Α. No, not to my knowledge. 20 Q. Have you ever been fired from any position 21 of employment you've held? 22 I already referred to the fact that I was asked to resign in January of 2006 from that position 23 24 of medical examiner.

Is that the only occasion?

25

Q.

A. Yes.

- Q. You don't have privileges at any hospital to treat patients, do you?
- A. No. I'm not a treating physician. And my hospital -- the hospital where I was chairman of the department of pathology closed 1999, 2000. I have not had a hospital affiliation since that time.
- Q. There are folks who do clinical pathology work, reviewing specimens on living patients and patients in hospitals?
- A. Yes. And I did that through my five-year residency and then from 1962 to the year 2000, for those 38 years I did it at several hospitals. And I'm board certified in clinical pathology as well as anatomic and forensic pathology.
- Q. As I understood your testimony, that part of your practice ended in the year 2000 sometime?
- A. Yes. The hospital closed, the parent hospital closed so they closed the St. Francis Central Hospital, that's correct, in the year 2000.
- Q. Have you ever had a civil suit filed against you?
- A. I think there was one once, and then I was dropped out. It really involved my colleague, but I was named initially, and I don't know whatever

113 1 happened, but I was dropped out of it. I was never 2 deposed or anything. But I do recall one time that I 3 was named at the beginning of a lawsuit. Q. Do you think that's the only time you've 5 been sued in a civil case? 6 Yes, when I was the chairman of the 7 department of pathology, and the action was against 8 the hospital and my colleague and they named me. 9 That's the only case involving the medical field. 10 What was it alleged that you did wrong in Ο. 11 the civil case? 12 Α. That I was chairman and therefore respondeat 13 superior. My colleague was charged with having made 14 a wrong diagnosis, and I was named also. 15 Even though you personally didn't evaluate 16 the specimen or make the report? 17 That's correct. My name was not on the Α. 18 report. 19 Q. Do you have a copy of your current fee 20 schedule there in front of you, doctor? 21 Α. Yes. It's right there. 22 Q. May I have this copy? 23 Α. Yes. I brought extras. 24 Ο. This is the fee schedule governing this 25 particular case?

```
114
 1
         Α.
              Yes.
 2
              MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark it as the next
     exhibit.
 3
 4
               (Deposition Exhibit No. 9 was marked for
 5
     identification.)
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
 6
 7
              Do you have with you today the invoices
 8
     showing the charges you made for your work in this
 9
     particular case?
10
         Α.
              Yes.
11
              These invoices when taken together will show
         Q.
     all of the fees that you've been paid up through the
12
13
     beginning time of the deposition today?
14
         Α.
              Yes.
15
              I see in here the check from my firm for the
16
     $3,500 payment for today's deposition. You got that;
17
     right?
18
         Α.
              Yes.
              MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark the invoices as
19
20
     collective Exhibit No. 10.
21
               (Deposition Exhibit No. 10 was marked for
22
     identification.)
23
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
              Your fee schedule indicates that there can
24
25
     be supplemental fees in given cases?
```

A. Yes.

- Q. Did that apply to this particular case?
- A. No. The only payment was the original submission fee and then the payment for the meeting and the work with Mr. Edwards relative to the deposition.
- Q. Is it your practice to require prepayment of fees?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. For all stages of the case?
- A. Well, yes, although not quite. I require submission or many times -- most of the time, always I guess -- well, I shouldn't say always, almost always with defense attorneys. I know that they don't have the payment, it's coming from their insurance company clients, and so I don't get the payment upon submission there. But there's the acknowledgement that they will pay. And then I require payment for depositions in advance.

Where I do not require payment in advance is in those cases that you referred to where I sometimes get supplemental materials of a substantial nature, lengthy depositions, investigative reports and so on, I do not charge an advance because I'm into the case and I get these things and I let it go. So anyway,

## Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

that's what happens, but otherwise I do request payment in advance with everybody else pretty much.

Once in a while a governmental agency, yeah, governmental agencies, I don't get paid in advance when I testified, district attorneys and all my homicide cases, I don't get paid in advance. Those are all bills that are submitted afterwards.

- Q. Do you require attorneys who retain you to sign contracts?
- A. No. I do, when an attorney tells me that they can't pay, their client is going to pay or something, I do ask them to send me a letter to that effect. And where attorneys are appointed by the court or public defenders, I do ask them to send me a copy of the court order or the court's approval for payment of the fee. I do request that.
- Q. I didn't see in your materials any of the defense expert disclosures in this case. Have you been provided with those?
  - A. No, I have not been.
  - Q. Do you know Dr. Greg Davis?
- A. I know that he's a forensic pathologist. I don't know him personally.
- Q. Do you know that he is a forensic pathologist at the University of Kentucky?

117 1 Α. Yes, I think that's where I thought he is, 2 yes. 3 Ο. Is he a well respected forensic pathologist? 4 Α. As far as I know he is a respected board 5 certified forensic pathologist. I have not had any 6 dealings with him, any cases, but I accept him as a board certified respected forensic pathologist. 7 8 Do you know Dr. Gary Vilke, V-i-l-k-e? Ο. 9 Α. No, I do not know him at all. I know 10 nothing about him, where he is or anything. 11 Ο. Did you notice he was one of the authors on 12 some of the articles? 13 Α. Yes, I remember that name. 14 Ο. You didn't know he was one of the experts 15 for the defense in this case? 16 Α. I don't know who the experts for the 17 defense are. 18 Give me your best estimate of how many times 19 you have been consulted as an expert witness in a 20 legal case, whether it be criminal or civil. 21 I would say, starting off in the early

years, I would say I get about probably on average

some workers' comp. That's pretty much been the

average. Yeah, I would say around there.

maybe three to four cases a month civil and criminal,

22

23

24

I would tend to say about 36 to 50 in the course of a year combined. That does not include the cases that I do autopsies in where the district attorney subsequently calls me to testify. There are maybe a dozen of those a year. So that's the answer.

- Q. Times how many years of doing this?
- A. Well, I started in the fall of 1962 when I came back to Pittsburgh after finishing all my training. But gee, I don't know, a case or two and then a couple of cases a year, then a few cases more. So probably it wasn't until maybe half a dozen years later that I could talk about the kind of average number that I gave you. But for the first several years I had nowhere near that number.
- Q. So if you were estimating for us the total number of times you've been consulted as an expert?
  - A. Consulted?

- Q. Yes, in a case of litigation, what would that number be?
- A. Consulted? Well, then if we go, let me say '67 to '17, because that's easy numbers. 33 and 17 is 50. 50 times 35 is 1,750. Then probably it comes out to be a couple thousand cases, throw in the earlier years. So probably then rough numbers maybe 2,000 to 3,000 since 1962.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

119 Ο. How many times would you estimate you've given depositions in cases where you've been retained as an expert? Α. Only about an average maybe of three or four a year. So that would be, again, probably about 250 to 300 depositions. 0. How many times have you testified at trial approximately? Α. Well, I testify roughly about a dozen times a year for the district attorneys on the homicides that I do. Aside from that, testimony, maybe on average just now, two or three times a year. overwhelming majority of cases insofar as my involvement is concerned do not wind up with me testifying. Q. Give me your best estimate of the number of times you've testified at trial total? Α. At trial? Total, for all the years. Q.

- A. For all the years, again, excluding the homicide cases for district attorneys that are follow-ups to autopsies that I've done, how many times have I testified? There again, I don't know, 250 to 350, something like that. I don't know.
  - Q. In the civil cases in which you've been

consulted as an expert, can you help us understand what portion of those have been at the request of the plaintiff and what portion has been at the request of the defense?

- A. What percentage of what, consultations?
- Q. Yes, sir, in civil cases.

A. Well, that has varied. I would say for the first -- I would say up into the -- roughly, this is nothing fixed, but roughly probably through the 1980s it was about 85 percent plaintiff.

The 1990s to the present time it's been 60-65 plaintiff and about 35-40 defense in civil cases consultant.

- Q. Give me the same approximation with regard to the depositions you've given in civil cases, what percent for plaintiff, what percent for defense?
- A. They would play out the same way. As I've said, there aren't that many depositions. So in the years up through into the 1990s, nine out of ten probably would have been for plaintiff.

1990s to the present time, probably when I have a deposition, it's probably about seven out of ten were for plaintiff and about three out of ten for defense. Something like that.

Q. How about trial, same question?

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

A. The same. I thought I gave you that. Oh, you want trial testimony. Again, gee, I just don't testify that much. Very little in civil cases. Very little. It's hard to give a percentage. So few cases.

I'm trying to remember the last time I testified in court in a civil case, and I can't remember when that was. Again, it would be into the 1990s when I did testify in court, probably about eight times out of ten would have been for the plaintiff and a couple times for the defense, as best as I can recollect.

I never thought about it. So few cases in which I testify civilly that it's hard for me to come up with a percentage.

- Q. Before this case, have you ever been involved in a case at the request of Mr. Tim Edwards or his law firm before?
- A. I don't recall Mr. Edwards at all. I do recall the name Ballin. I think I had a case with Mr. Ballin, but I'm just not sure, but I think did. I don't remember what it was or whenever. The name is familiar.
  - Q. Do you know how many cases you had for Mr. Ballin?

- A. I think only one, as far as I believe, only one. I don't know what it was.
- Q. Have you ever been excluded as an expert witness by any court?
  - A. No, not to my knowledge.
- Q. Have you ever been prohibited from giving any particular opinion in a given case, even though you may have been permitted to testify about other things? You look confused. Do you need me to rephrase?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. You understand this as a lawyer, a judge could rule that a witness cannot testify at all, and you've told me that has not happened; correct?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And then a judge could rule that a witness may testify but may not express some of the opinions he wishes to give. I'm asking you now if the latter has happened to you?
- A. Oh, I don't know. There's always objections by attorneys. I don't remember a judge's response. I'm sure sometimes objections are sustained, of course. Not anything as a matter of judicial law unprecipitated by a lawyer's objection as a judicial ruling of a preparatory nature. I'm not aware

123 anything like that. 1 No. 2 MR. PHILLIPS: I want to mark the deposition 3 notice as the next exhibit. 4 (Deposition Exhibit No. 11 was marked for 5 identification.) 6 MR. GASS: Can I have a question read back. 7 (Requested portion of testimony was read 8 back by reporter.) 9 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 10 Q. Doctor, in the deposition notice we asked 11 you to bring certain things with you today. Have you 12 made an attempt to comply with bringing all of your materials related to this case with you? 13 14 Α. Yes. 15 Q. Are there any materials you have related to 16 this case that are not in the room with us today? 17 Α. No. 18 Let's identify clearly for the record the Q. materials that you have reviewed in this case. 19 20 think we may have covered some of them in the course 21 of our conversation. We've got the summaries 22 provided to you by Mr. Edwards; right? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Ο. We've got the medical records that came at 25 some point from Baptist Hospital?

124 1 Α. Yes. 2 Ο. And what other documents have you reviewed? 3 Other medical records of Mr. Goode from his Α. 4 primary care physician having nothing to do with this 5 case, I received those records, too. 6 Did those impact your opinions at all? 7 Α. They just confirmed that he had asthma, but otherwise had nothing to do really with my 8 9 opinion, other than as it may relate to the asthmatic 10 condition and as I'm aware of it. But as I've 11 already said, I only know of this from the records 12 and from Mr. Edwards, not from my autopsy findings. 13 Ο. Are those the records from the primary care 14 physician? 15 Α. Yes. 16 MR. PHILLIPS: Let's mark those as the next exhibit. 17 18 (Deposition Exhibit No. 12 was marked for identification.) 19 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 20 21 Q. Ultimately, did you review the autopsy 22 report from Mississippi? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. And the tox reports from Mississippi? 25 Α. Yes.

125 1 Q. And the tox reports that you requested be 2 done? Α. Yes. 3 Is there anything else you reviewed other 4 Ο. 5 than what we just listed here together? 6 Well, there's, yeah, I had two expert 7 reports; one from, that's been referred to today, from Dr. David Nichols. 8 9 Ο. And the date on that, please? 10 Α. January 11, 2016. 11 Q. Yes, sir. 12 And then I have a report from a cardiology 13 expert retained by Mr. Edwards, from Dr. Parim, 14 P-a-r-i-m, Parikh, P-a-r-i-k-h, dated January 31, 15 2017, a report to Mr. Edwards from Dr. Parikh. 16 Ο. Does that have any bearings on your 17 opinions? 18 Well, yes, it does. Α. It's consistent with 19 and corroborative of from a clinician, from a 20 cardiologist. So I've arrived at my opinions 21 independently, however, so you ask did it have any 22 effect, just the effect that, speak for myself, that 23 I would always have when someone that I do not know 24 and especially in a different area of medicine sets 25 forth an opinion that is very consistent with mine;

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

126

so in that sense it has. But my opinion had already been submitted, as you can tell, because I did not get Dr. Parikh's report until February of this year. It was not submitted to Mr. Edwards until January 31 of this year.

- Is there anything else you reviewed? Ο.
- Α. There's a statement here from an attorney representing the hospital that I had received. There's something else, a letter that was sent to Attorney Edwards by I think one of the gentlemen here today, Attorney David Upchurch, dated August 31, 2015. I was sent a copy of that letter. I also --
- Q. Hang on just a minute. Did this letter, August of 2015 from Mr. Upchurch, have any bearing on any of your opinions?
- Well, only in the sense that it corroborated what I already knew, namely that no heart monitoring had taken place prior to the code that was called. That was confirmed by Attorney Upchurch. confirmed what I already knew.

MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark that as the next exhibit number.

(Deposition Exhibit No. 13 was marked for identification.)

127 1 THE WITNESS: Then I received a statement 2 taken by -- it is an interview conducted by Keith Hainey of somebody identified as HR manager. 3 4 was sent to me on July 23, 2015. Mr. Edwards sent 5 that to me. The date of the interview was July 18, 6 This interview is of someone who was at the 7 hospital when this occurred. That was sent to me. BY MR. PHILLIPS: 8 9 Did that have any bearing on your opinions 10 in the case? Not directly. Again, it confirmed the fact 11 Α. 12 that -- it just confirmed the observations set forth 13 that I was already aware of in terms of what was 14 taking place and how the police were conducting 15 themselves and so on. So it blends in consistent 16 with, supportive of my overall understanding of this 17 case. 18 MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark it as the next 19 exhibit. 20 (Deposition Exhibit No. 14 was marked for identification.) 21 22 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 23 What else have you reviewed in the case that 24 we've not previously identified, doctor? 25 Α. The photo, the disk that came with the

1	autopsy from Mississippi. I just received a few days
2	ago photos of the autopsy from the medical examiner's
3	office sent to me by Mr. Edwards' office.
4	Q. Have you reviewed the photos?
5	A. Yes, I have looked at them.
6	Q. Did those photos have any bearing on any
7	opinion you hold in the case?
8	A. No, they're of no relevance one way or the
9	other.
10	Q. Have we covered everything that you've
11	reviewed in this case?
12	A. Yes, I believe so.
13	Q. What correspondence do you have with
14	Mr. Edwards
15	A. You've seen it, here it is.
16	Q. Let me finish the question, if I could.
17	What correspondence do you have from
18	Mr. Edwards or his firm that we've not already marked
19	as an exhibit?
20	A. Nothing. It's what was here.
21	Q. It looks like you have something in your
22	hand?
23	A. Yeah, but you already had this folder.
24	Q. We haven't marked it.
25	MR. PHILLIPS: The correspondence will be

```
129
1
     collective Exhibit No. 15.
 2
              (Deposition Exhibit No. 15 was marked for
     identification.)
 3
4
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
              What is in this file?
 5
         Ο.
 6
              This is the one from my autopsy report.
 7
     That's the label that we put on here in my office
 8
     with the autopsy number and a couple of letters, and
     the autopsy report is around somewhere.
 9
              MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark these materials as
10
11
     the next exhibit.
12
              (Deposition Exhibit No. 16 was marked for
     identification.)
13
14
     BY MR. PHILLIPS:
15
         Ο.
              Have we covered it all or are there things
     remaining?
16
17
         Α.
              No, I think you have it all.
18
              That folder you have in front of you says
         Ο.
     timeline?
19
20
              These are the timelines, yes.
         Α.
21
         Ο.
              Is that separate than what we've already
     marked?
22
23
         Α.
              Yes, that's different. It's not the
24
     timeline that was marked before.
                                        These are just
25
     other timelines. They're all consistent.
```

130 1 MR. PHILLIPS: We'll mark these as the next exhibit. 2 3 (Deposition Exhibit No. 17 was marked for 4 identification.) 5 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 6 Did you bring any records that would show 7 your income just from being an expert witness in the 8 last few years? 9 Α. No. 10 Ο. Are you able to estimate that for us? 11 Α. My income from what? 12 Serving as an expert witness, whether it be Q. 13 consultations, depositions, trials, reviews. 14 No. All monies that I make go into just one 15 account, Cyril H. Wecht Pathology and Associates. Ι 16 have no breakdown. We report all of it to our 17 accountant and it all goes in together. 18 0. What would you estimate would be the 19 percentage of your annual income that you derive from 20 your expert witness work? 21 Well, most of my income by far is from 22 autopsies and then what flows from those autopsies. 23 So, gee, I don't know, it's probably maybe roughly 24 two to one, something like that. I can't be sure 25 exactly a percentage.

Q. I'm sorry, I didn't understand the percentage.

- A. Roughly two to one in terms of the percentages of my income from autopsies and what flows from that with the district attorneys and testimony and so on on the one hand, and then the money from consultations that I make.
- Q. So express for me as a percentage your estimate of your percentage of your income from your expert witness related work.
  - A. I just gave you the estimate.
- Q. You gave me a ratio. How would you express it as a percentage?
- A. It would be about roughly -- well, then a percentage that comes out to be roughly 65/35, something like that.
- Q. With 65 being which portion?
- A. Of my autopsies and what flows from the autopsies.
- Q. Do you advertise your services as an expert witness?
- A. No.

Q. Other than what we've already marked as an exhibit, were you provided any facts or data by Plaintiff's counsel that you considered in forming

132 1 your opinions? 2 I've talked with Mr. Edwards, he's told Α. No. me a lot of things, but nothing that is startlingly 3 4 or significantly new and nothing different, no. No, 5 nothing. We talked earlier about your September 28, 6 Ο. 7 2015 letter. Remember me showing you a copy of that? Α. Yes. 8 9 MR. PHILLIPS: I want to mark that as the next exhibit. 10 11 (Deposition Exhibit No. 18 was marked for 12 identification.) 13 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 14 I think you told me earlier that you did not 15 have a copy of the September 28, 2015 letter in your 16 file; correct? 17 Α. That's right. 18 Do you know why you didn't retain a copy of that letter? 19 20 Α. Because it was sent to Mr. Edwards marked I 21 think work product for him to look over and tell me 22 if there was anything that I had not addressed. 23 apparently, and I don't know this as a matter of 24 specific recollection, but I can only infer reasonably that Mr. Edwards probably did not get back 25

133 1 to me until around the time that the final report was generated. But it is exactly the same, with no 2 changes. 3 Do you have an electronic file with any 4 Ο. information about this case? 5 Ά. No. 6 So everything that you have is on paper and 7 Ο. there's no electronic file at all? 8 I have no electronic files. 9 Ά. MR. PHILLIPS: Dr. Wecht, these other 10 counsel have been waiting patiently to question you. 11 12 I'm going to yield to some of the other gentlemen in the room to ask questions. I may or may not have 13 14 additional questions when they finish, but I 15 appreciate your time. Let's take a brief recess. MR. UPCHURCH: 16 17 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken off the 18 record.) 19 20 EXAMINATION BY MR. UPCHURCH: 21 Dr. Wecht, my name is David Upchurch. 2.2 Ο. 23 met immediately prior to your deposition some hours 24 I'll endeavor in my questioning not to be repetitive of Mr. Phillips. I would ask of you if 25

2.4

## Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

you don't understand a question that I ask, if you would please let me know that, I'll be more than happy to rephrase the question.

In looking at the documents that have been marked as Exhibit No. 4, there were timelines or summaries that were provided to you, and I have a few questions about those.

I'm looking at a summary that was sent to you by email dated Tuesday, August 11, 2015 by Ms. Asbridge in Mr. Edwards' office. In that email there is a delineation of some events that gave rise to this lawsuit.

There is a note that at 2:30, and I'm quoting now, "Troy smoked at home (a joint); from a batch he had previously smoked from; no issues; Kelli has what's left; Troy a daily smoker; purchases from the same person".

Did you make any request to receive a batch of the marijuana that Troy smoked for testing purposes?

- A. Not that I recall. If there had been any discussion it would have been to have it submitted to NMS to have them do the testing. But no, not that I recall.
  - Q. Do you have any knowledge that that

135 1 marijuana that was referred to in the statement I 2 just read you has been tested by AMS or any other 3 laboratory? 4 MR. EDWARDS: NMS. 5 BY MR. PHILLIPS: 6 Ο. Sorry. NMS. 7 There's a report from NMS on marijuana with a very high level. I don't know if that relates to 8 that batch or not. 9 10 Ο. Do you have any information as to the name 11 of the person from whom Troy purchased his marijuana? Α. 12 No. 13 Ο. Same question or similar question, several 14 times, several bullets down on this same email, it 15 says "Troy and others gathered around in a circle (doing liquid LSD) ". 16 17 Do you have any information, Dr. Wecht, as 18 to how Troy consumed the LSD that's at issue in this 19 case? 20 Α. My recollection is they put something on the 21 back of his hand and licked it or something. 22 my understanding. 23 Ο. Continuing on that bullet point says, "(Mike 24 Friedman had same vial over a year; Troy used LSD on 25 paper previously while in Chicago from same vial) no

issues".

Did you ever make a request of Mr. Edwards to receive a copy of the vial of LSD referenced in this notation that I've just read to you so that it could be tested?

- A. No.
- Q. Do you have any knowledge that any such vial of LSD has been tested by any laboratory?
- A. No, I have no knowledge of anything like that.
- Q. In this same email, Dr. Wecht, there is a note that talks about the officers' interactions with Mr. Goode. And it says, and it's referencing the attack is referenced in here of one of the police dogs, and the bullet point says this: "At this point Kelli was trying to film incident with cell phone saying, quote, I am filming you, close quote."

Did you receive any film from Mr. Edwards depicting the incident at the scene with police and Mr. Goode?

- A. No.
- Q. Do I understand correctly from your testimony this morning that because you do not accept excited delirium as a scientific diagnosis, you did not consider that diagnosis as a potential cause of

Alpha Reporting Corporation

Mr. Goode's death in this case?

- A. That would be correct. I mean, I anticipated it and told Mr. Edwards that, but did I consider it? No. Your question contains the answer.
- Q. Although not stated in this fashion, your opinion is that Mr. Goode's death was secondary to positional asphyxia?
- A. Secondary? It was caused by positional asphyxiation, yes.
  - Q. Define for me positional asphyxiation.
- A. Well, in this case it's the full classical hogtied position with the individual, Mr. Goode, in a prone position, that's face, abdomen down, wrists tied behind him together and legs tied together at the ankles and brought up in flexed position at the knees. That's the classical hogtied position.

That is the physical scenario in which a person then in my opinion can die as a result of the respiratory compromise and then the subsequent effects on cardiac activity. That's positional asphyxiation.

So positional refers to the anatomic lie of the individual, the position of that person. And asphyxiation, deprivation of oxygen or diminution of oxygen. And that to me is the way in which this

works.

And then the heart gets insulted and you have the cycle of diminished oxygenation to the brain and then diminished compromise control by the brain of cardiac and respiratory function, which leads to further diminution of oxygen. And that cycle just works very, very rapidly. And then ultimately you have cardiorespiratory arrest and death.

- Q. Let me read this definition to you of positional asphyxia and see if you agree with it.

  "Cessation of adequate breathing by means of restraint and can occur by either positioning to compromise the airway, compression to inhibit the respiratory function or a combination of both such mechanisms."
- A. Well, I agree with it, but I don't think it's complete. Read it one more time, please.
- Q. Yes, sir. "Cessation of adequate breathing by means of restraint and can occur by either positioning to compromise the airway or compression to inhibit the respiratory function or a combination of both such mechanisms."
- A. Well, first of all, it's not cessation.

  Ultimately of course when you go into

  cardiorespiratory arrest there is cessation, but the

# Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

position does not lead to cessation in the way that if something collapses upon you or somebody stuffs something in your mouth or covers up your nose and throat, so-called burking.

So I would use diminution, compromise rather than cessation. There was nothing obstructing the airway here at all. And then compression, I wouldn't use that word, it's not compression necessarily. You can have positional asphyxiation without anybody pressing down on your chest, which does occur in many of these cases with one or more policemen pressing down knees, feet, baton or what have you.

So no, I would not -- I don't think it's a correctly, fully, properly stated definition from my perspective of positional asphyxiation. No, I don't agree with it. I don't accept that. It's part of it. You can get that happening of course in either of those two ways, but that doesn't depict the entire set of etiological factors.

- Q. Would it surprise you to know, Dr. Wecht, that I took that definition out of a text that you published?
- A. Yes, it would. It has to be revised then. What publication is it, if I can ask?
  - Q. Your text Investigating and Prevention of

140 1 Officer-Involved Deaths? Did I write that? 2 Α. 3 Ο. Yes, sir. 4 Α. When was that? Where was it published? 5 Don't know. Ο. 6 I don't mind criticizing myself. Could I Α. 7 just see that again, please. 8 Yes, sir. Ο. There's your book, Investigation and Prevention of Officer-Involved Death. You're one 9 of the authors. 10 11 Α. Yes, I wrote that with Dr. Lee and two 12 retired police chiefs. 13 How do you understand in this case that 14 Mr. Goode was hoptied, to use your term; do you understand that his hands and the shackles on his 15 16 feet were actually bound together where his hands 17 were touching his feet? 18 Α. No, I don't think that the feet were brought 19 up to that point. My understanding is that the 20 wrists were tied behind him, his ankles were tied 21 behind him and that there was a long shaft that went 22 up along his back that coursed I guess under or over 23 those two sets of handcuffs. 24 It's not my understanding that the four 25 portions of his upper and lower appendages were

contiguous.

- Q. Is a person who is obese or a person who has a large abdomen at an increased risk for experiencing positional asphyxia?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is that because the size of the stomach is then -- or the stomach contents are pushed upwards and then there's pressure placed upon the diaphragm?
- A. More so the liver than the gastric contents, because you don't know whether somebody has eaten or not, obviously they have a big full stomach.

No, sir, it's more so the liver which occupies and goes a little bit past the midline from the right side and comes up into the diaphragm.

- Q. Would we agree, doctor, that Mr. Goode was certainly not obese by any definition?
- A. Yes. The weights that I see, no, he was not obese.
  - Q. Would you also agree that there are preexisting physical conditions that can increase one's risk for positional asphyxia, such as heart disease?
  - A. Oh, sure. If you have heart disease you would be that much more susceptible, depending upon how severe it is. If you have valvular disease or if

you have atherosclerosis of the coronary arteries, sure, that could further compromise the picture because you already have some compromise of the normal cardiovascular flow.

- Q. Would bronchitis fall into that list of preexisting diseases that might increase one's risk for positional asphyxia?
- A. If you had a chronic bronchial condition like asthma, bronchiectasis, or significant chronic bronchitis, it could.
  - Q. What about emphysema?

2.2

- A. Emphysema could, too, yes.
- Q. What about an exacerbation of an asthmatic condition?
- A. If somebody has asthma, then that person would be more susceptible to any kind of diminution or deprivation of oxygen because the disease is in place and there is that tendency, and we don't know the etiology of many asthmatic conditions, but there's something there that causes the bronchioles to constrict, producing that kind of obstruction and diminished oxygen flow.

So yes, if you have a significant or you have an asthmatic condition, it could make you more susceptible.

Q. Are there any other physical conditions that you would add to that list of conditions that would increase one's risk for experiencing positional asphyxia?

A. No. Hepatic, adrenal, cerebral. No, basically, you're dealing with the heart and lungs and the components thereof. So in the case of the heart, obviously the coronary arteries and the valves. And in the case of the lungs, the trachea, somebody could have, you know, we already talked about bronchitis, if he had some problem involving the pharyngeal area, the epiglottic area, the higher area before it goes into the lung tissue.

But as far as other body organ systems, no, not getting into psychological things, how it would be handled.

- Q. My question was dealt to medical conditions.
- A. Limited to the respiratory and cardiac and if he had anything in the oral pharyngeal system. Then of course if somebody had dentures, that could produce a problem, but we don't have that in this case.
- Q. You did not find any evidence of underlying heart disease for Mr. Goode, did you?
  - A. No.

Q. You did not find any underlying disease of bronchitis or emphysema?

A. No.

Q. And found neither grossly nor

microscopically any asthmatic condition that you

A. That's right.

could report, did you?

- Q. Am I correct in understanding your prior testimony to questions asked by Mr. Phillips that you did not find on your autopsy any evidence of ischemic encephalopathy?
- A. No. The brain had been sectioned and nothing was grossly evident or microscopically.
- Q. Am I likewise correct in understanding that you did not find any gross or microscopic evidence of multi-organ system failure?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. You discussed with Mr. Phillips some symptoms that you would attribute to the theory of excited delirium, a medical condition that you don't recognize, and we certainly understand that, but see if you'll agree with me about a list of symptoms that are associated with that diagnosis. One would be an individual who is impervious to pain?
  - A. No, I can't agree with that. I'm aware that

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

people who believe in excited delirium and these police-related deaths, they confer upon the victim literally Superman abilities, they can lift cars and harrow them through space and they don't feel pain and so on. No, I do not. There is nothing that makes the person, that happens to the nervous system, the sensory nerves, impervious to pain. No, I do not agree with that.

- Q. All right, sir. What about the symptom of having a significant increased or great strength as you just mentioned that you believe that is a symptom of excited deliria?
- A. I'm aware of that. The answer is this:
  When you're faced with an emergency, can you
  sometimes do things that you might not ordinarily
  consider and so on? Yes. But not the kind of
  increased physical strength that is attributed to
  these people by the proponents of excited delirium.
  No, I do not agree with that. You don't all of a
  sudden become Clark Kent in disguise.
  - Q. What about hyperthermia?
- A. Again, I'm aware of that finding. I do agree that in those cases which they classify, categorize as excited delirium that they list hyperthermia. And I've discussed that in this case

146 1 it was not present. 2. Ο. What about sweating? 3 MR. EDWARDS: Excuse me, did you say hypo or 4 hyperthermia? BY MR. PHILLIPS: 5 6 Ο. Hyper. 7 Α. Hyper. 8 What about sweating? Ο. 9 Α. That would depend to a large degree on the 10 environment. Certainly if you're struggling and so on, it goes on for a period of time, you might begin 11 12 to sweat. It depends how long a time, how much the 13 struggle is, what kind of clothing, what is the 14 temperature. So that would vary. 15 What about do you believe that bizarre and violent behaviors is a symptom associated with 16 17 excited deliria? 18 Α. Again, I attribute this to the combination 19 of the inability to breathe normally, the entire 20 scenario, your body being bound in that fashion and the police there and yelling at you and so on, I can 21 22 just imagine the choice epithets that were used, although I have no recordation of that. 23 24 Combative, yes; when you can't breathe and 25 you're bound in that fashion, I understand why you

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

147 would become combative. But again, as you have already stated, what I'm saying is I understand that this is considered to be a component of the excited delirium phenomenon. And I don't accept excited delirium, but I am aware of that sign. Signs are things that you can see, by the And symptoms are things that are expressed by the person. So you got a combination of signs and symptoms there. Ο. Yes, sir. I'm reading from your book where it says excited delirium symptoms include: Impervious to pain, great strength, hyperthermia, sweating, bizarre and violent behavior, aggression, hyperactivity, hallucinations, confusion and disorientation, foaming at the mouth, drooling and dilated pupils. Do you agree with that list of symptoms associated with excited delirium? Α. For those people, yes, who believe in excited delirium, yes, those are the list of signs and symptoms. Do you know whether or not this case has Ο. been scheduled for trial?

- Α. No. I have no trial date.
- Q. Have you been requested to appear at trial

148 1 in this case? 2 Α. There's been no discussion at all with 3 Mr. Edwards about that, but if I am called to testify 4 pursuant to my report, this deposition, etcetera, I shall testify, but there's been no discussion. 5 6 haven't any idea at all what the status of this case 7 is. 8 MR. UPCHURCH: Thank you, sir. That's all 9 the questions I have for you. 10 MR. GASS: Can we go off the record a 11 minute. I have one thing I want to ask that I'm 12 confused on. 13 MR. EDWARDS: We're not going to have two 14 lawyers. MR. GASS: That's why I said we're going off 15 the record. 16 17 MR. EDWARDS: I just want to make clear that 18 we've got one lawyer per client. 19 (Whereupon, a short recess was taken off the 20 record.) 21 MR. MILLER: My name is Steve Miller, I'm the attorney for Southeastern Emergency Physicians. 22 23 I don't have any questions for you. Pass the 24 witness. 25 MR. UPCHURCH: Brad, any questions?

149 1 MR. DILLARD: Just one or two brief 2 questions. 3 4 EXAMINATION 5 BY MR. DILLARD: Doctor, this is Brad Dillard, I represent 6 7 the Southaven Defendants. 8 You referenced at length in your report the 9 phrase hogtied in conjunction with four-point restraint. In your opinion is there any difference 10 11 between the phrase hogtied and four-point restraint? 12 Α. No, I guess I would take that synonymously. 13 Four-point, right, the two wrists and the two ankles. 14 Some people may use hogtied in a strict classical, 15 limiting it to ankles brought up in hyperflexion to wrists posteriorly, and I would not argue with that 16 17 then. 18 So that differentiation could be made between that kind of hogtie if that's what somebody 19 is talking about. I am aware, as I was asked earlier 20 21 a little bit ago, that the ankles were not brought up 22 to the wrists. 23 Your use of the term hogtied then would 24 simply be any type of shackle or device where the 25 ankles and the wrists are bound together regardless

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

of the length of the chain or the ability to move; would that be correct?

- A. Well, yeah, in this case where they're all tied, and there's a rod pole or shaft that goes along the length of the body. Yes, that's the way I would use that in this case.
- Q. Just to be sure I'm clear, doctor, your opinions in this case are limited to Mr. Goode's cause of death; correct?
- A. If you're asking me am I going to be an expert on -- I've already talked about medical malpractice, I'm not going to express any opinions on that regarding the EMS hospital doctors and nurses, and I'm not going to express opinions other than that which I know that fall into my domain as I have referred to several times today regarding law enforcement agencies and so on.

But if this were, let's say, an analog of a medical malpractice case against law enforcement officers, no, I'm not going to be expressing opinions on that. Just the overall scenario, but not breaking it down into specific actions attributed to any particular officer.

Q. Yes, sir. The full scope of your opinions has been discussed during the examination primarily

151 1 by other counsel; correct? 2 Yes. Α. I do not believe that there's anything that was not covered. Mr. Edwards will come in with 3 4 his own approach, but I think everything has been 5 covered. I'm not aware of any area -- I may be asked 6 other questions about specific actions here and 7 there, but there's nothing that we haven't talked 8 about. 9 MR. DILLARD: Thank you. No further 10 questions. 11 MR. PHILLIPS: I have one housekeeping 12 matter. Doctor, I was told I need to bring a check 13 if we went over four hours. What is the amount 14 owing? 15 THE WITNESS: \$500. 16 MR. PHILLIPS: I'm about to give you that 17 check now. 18 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 19 MR. GASS: Just housekeeping on the rest of 20 the exhibits, madam court reporter, are you going to 21 give us hard copies, electronic copies? 22 COURT REPORTER: Whatever you prefer. 23 Please let me know what you would like. 24 MR. EDWARDS: For the Plaintiff, I want an 25 electronic copy, E-Tran, and electronic copies of the

```
152
 1
     exhibits. And Dr. Wecht will get the hard back.
 2
              THE WITNESS: And a hard copy of the
 3
     transcript?
 4
              MR. EDWARDS:
                            I will get you that.
 5
              COURT REPORTER:
                               Do you want to read the
 6
     transcript?
 7
              MR. EDWARDS: Do you want to read and sign?
 8
              THE WITNESS: I'll need a hard copy unless
 9
    you tell me.
10
              MR. EDWARDS: Let's reserve signature.
11
              MR. UPCHURCH: I would like an electronic
    and a hard copy, and I assume that will come with a
12
13
     condensed and a word index.
14
              MR. PHILLIPS: Marty Phillips, I get the
15
     original since I set the deposition and of course
16
     copies of all the exhibits. I also want an
    electronic copy, and will you provide a condensed
17
18
     version as well?
19
              COURT REPORTER: Yes.
20
              MR. MILLER: Same for me, Stephen Miller.
21
    Not the original, but a copy.
22
              MR. DILLARD:
                            This is Brad Dillard, I'll
23
     take the same as Mr. Upchurch ordered, please.
24
              (Deposition Exhibit Nos. 19 through 35 were
25
    marked for identification.)
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017

153 MR. GASS: Let me make a record of what has been marked. Exhibit No. 19 is an empty folder. What I'm asking is that there be just a photocopy of these folders with the exhibit sticker. Exhibit No. 20 has papers in it, so both the outside of the folder and the papers that are inside Exhibit No. 21, same thing, photocopy of the outside plus the papers that are in it. Exhibit No. 22, photocopy of the outside plus the papers inside. Exhibit No. 23 is a CD disk that we would want a copy of. Exhibit No. 24, outside of the folder plus the papers that are in it. Exhibit No. 25, the 1-11-2016 Purdue letter. Exhibit No. 26 email packet. Exhibit No. 27 Wecht letter of December 5, 2016. Exhibit No. 28, the packet of photos plus a copy of all photos inside. Exhibit No. 29, just a copy of the empty folder. Exhibit No. 30, copy of the empty folder. No. 31, a copy of the empty folder. 32, copy of the empty folder. 33, a complete copy. And his slides have been marked, there are two yellow trays, one is marked Exhibit No. 34 and one is marked Exhibit Those we don't need copies of. No. 35. MR. EDWARDS: Show that those will be

```
154
 1
     retained by Dr. Wecht.
               MR. PHILLIPS: Lay those on the copier and
 2
     make a copy of the front page.
 3
 4
               (At 1:35 p.m., the deposition was concluded.
 5
     Signature was not waived.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Cyril Wecht, MD - March 21, 2017					
1		ERRATA SHEET	155			
2			REASON FOR			
3	PAGE	LINE CHANGE/CORRECTION	CHANGE/CORRECTION			
4	41	lines 1-8				
5		Torrection -				
6		I had recen	Tell a video of the			
7	WWW.0074-WWW.co.ok.	scene from attorney	Echvards.			
8		- I viewed	thetwiseo as push			
9		of my overall never	en and analysis of			
10		This case				
11	4	and the same of th	Egzel Hacht Mix			
12	Martin		6 April 2017			
13						
14	·		- Marie Mari			
15						
16						
17	***************************************					
18						
19						
20 21						
21 22	····		Addition to the state of the st			
22 23						
23 24	<del></del>		-			
2 <b>4</b> 25		**************************************				
ب ے						

# Cyril Wecht, MD - March 21, 2017 156 1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 I, CYRIL H. WECHT, MD, JD, do hereby certify 4 that I have read the foregoing transcript and it is a 5 true and correct copy of my deposition, except for the changes, if any, made by me on the attached 6 7 Deposition Correction Sheet. 8 9 10 11 6 April 2017 12 Date 13 14 15 Sworn to + SUBSCRIBED before me years 7 th Day of April, 2017 16 17 18 19 20 MWWW 21 22 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA NOTARIAL SEAL 23 Richard W. Kelly Jr., Notary Public City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County 24 My Commission Expires May 6, 2019 MEMBER, PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF NOVARIES 25

```
157
 1
     COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA )
                                     SS
 2
     COUNTY OF WASHINGTON
 3
 4
                         CERTIFICATE
 5
              I, Kathy D. Landock, a Notary Public in and
     for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, do hereby
 6
     certify that the witness, CYRIL H. WECHT, MD, JD, was
     by me first duly sworn to testify the truth, the
 7
     whole truth, and nothing but the truth; that the
     foregoing deposition was taken at the time and place
     stated herein; and that the said deposition was
 8
     recorded stenographically by me and then reduced to
     typewriting under my direction, and constitutes a
 9
     true record of the testimony given by said witness,
10
     all to the best of my skill and ability.
11
              I further certify that I am not a relative,
     employee or attorney of any of the parties, or a
12
     relative or employee of either counsel, and that I am
     in no way interested directly or indirectly in this
13
     action.
14
              IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
     hand and affixed my seal of office this 24th day of
15
     March, 2017.
16
17
                   Kathy D. Landock, Notary Public
                   Certified Realtime Reporter
18
19
     My Commission Expires:
     March 24, 2019
20
2.1
22
23
24
25
```

\$	<b>19</b> 82:12 152:24	<b>21</b> 11:1	<b>40,000</b> 52:21 69:8
	<b>1962</b> 112:12 118:7,25	<b>23</b> 8:7,9,16 9:2 12:4	
<b>\$2,200</b> 103:15	<b>1979</b> 46:19	16:15,19 22:21 31:8 32:2 35:24 127:4	5
<b>\$2,500</b> 103:16	<b>1980s</b> 120:9	<b>24</b> 72:8 74:22	<b>5</b> 8:10 9:1 16:2 17:13
<b>\$3,500</b> 114:16	<b>1990s</b> 120:11,19,21	<b>250</b> 119:5,24	19:21,25 20:14 22:18 25:14 27:8 28:24 30:2
<b>\$3,850</b> 36:1,9	121:9	<b>26-</b> 93:19	36:11,13,16 38:18 41:
<b>500</b> 151:15	<b>1998</b> 82:13	<b>275</b> 16:11	53:14 54:4 61:19,21,
<b>\$6,475</b> 36:6	<b>1999</b> 112:6	275th 16:17	22,23 70:1,3 74:3 88:17
<b>\$800</b> 36:4	2		<b>50</b> 99:11 118:1,22
		<b>28</b> 29:7 30:12,20 37:19 40:25 132:6,15	<b>55</b> 52:18,20
0	<b>2</b> 12:18 13:6 14:25 28:4	<b>29</b> 15:10 41:19 44:15	<b>56</b> 57:8
<b>05</b> 107:2	37:21 38:19,22 39:18 41:1 88:21	46:10,15	
	<b>2,000</b> 118:25	<b>2:30 1</b> 34:13	6
<b>06</b> 106:13 107:4			_
1	<b>20</b> 8:4,13,18 10:17,19 32:1,3 77:6 109:13	3	<b>6</b> 22:18 62:14 94:21,22
/Autorian and an annual and an an annual and an annual an annual and an annual an annual and an annual an annual and an annual and an annual and an annual and an annual an annual and an annual an an	110:10	<b>3</b> 8:12 22:5,6,11 61:19,	<b>60-65</b> 120:12
<b>1</b> 11:6,7 82:19 88:21	<b>20,000</b> 52:21	22 74:6,20	<b>65</b> 131:17
<b>1,750</b> 118:22	<b>2000</b> 112:6,12,17,20	<b>3,000</b> 118:25	<b>65/35</b> 131:15
<b>10</b> 42:9,11 109:13	<b>2006</b> 111:23	<b>30</b> 77:6	<b>67</b> 118:21
114:20,21	<b>2007</b> 88:21	<b>300</b> 119:6	
<b>100</b> 49:12 78:24 97:21 99:11,23	2008 65:19	<b>31</b> 68:23 125:14 126:4,	7
<b>11</b> 55:21 68:20 123:4	<b>2009</b> 107:22	12	<b>7</b> 84:25 100:14
125:10 134:9	<b>201</b> 82:13	<b>33</b> 118:21	<b>70s</b> 110:25
<b>12</b> 62:12 124:18	<b>2013</b> 65:20 95:2	33-year-old 85:12	
<b>13</b> 126:24	<b>2015</b> 8:4,7,9,13 11:1	93:19	8
<b>14</b> 21:16 127:20	16:14 18:4,8,10 22:14	<b>35</b> 118:22 152:24	<b>8</b> 102:8
<b>15</b> 16:9 62:11 109:13	25:4,6 29:7 30:12,20 31:8 35:24 40:25	<b>35-40</b> 120:12	
110:10 129:1,2	42:11,23 43:6 62:24	<b>350</b> 119:24	80s 110:25
<b>15-275</b> 15:12	126:12,15 127:4,6 132:7,15 134:9	<b>36</b> 118:1	<b>84</b> 107:15
<b>16</b> 62:16 129:12	<b>2016</b> 8:10 9:1 16:3	<b>38</b> 112:13	<b>85</b> 120:10
<b>169</b> 100:24 101:16	17:13 19:21 20:14	<b>3:30</b> 9:5	86 7:16
<b>17</b> 25:4,6 43:6 118:21	21:16 25:14 27:8 28:24	<b>3rd</b> 107: <b>1</b> 7	870 24:5
130:3	29:24 30:21 36:11,14, 16 37:19 38:18 41:9		<b>8:49</b> 74:7
<b>171</b> 90:13 91:6	53:14 55:21 70:1 74:3	4	9
<b>173</b> 90:7,17 91:17 92:8	125:10	<b>4</b> 15:9 22:14 27:7 40:18	<b>J</b>
<b>175</b> 92:25	<b>2017</b> 85:19 125:15	41:9 54:8,21 62:14	<b>9</b> 68:19 114:4
<b>18</b> 18:3,8,10 37:7 42:23	<b>205</b> 82:13	70:3 134:5	90 71:17,19 72:9 74:21
62:24 127:5 132:11		<b>40</b> 9:20	

	<del></del>			
90s 111:1	acid 62:1	agent 79:18	analyzed 44:2 87:24	
<b>993</b> 95:17	acknowledge 58:21	aggravated 64:20	analyzes 14:21	
<b>994</b> 97:11,15	acknowledged 56:15	aggravating 65:4 anatomic 112:15		
<b>9:22</b> 74:7	106:2	aggression 147:13	137:22	
	acknowledgement	Aggressive 89:2	anatomical 13:25 77:25	
Α	acquire 52:16 56:15	agitative 64:13	and/or 69:9	
abdomen 137:13	acronym 66:17	agree 35:22 62:21 83:3	animal 75:17	
141:3	_	85:9,14 89:15 91:2,4,5,  action 111:14 113:7 23,24 92:3,6 93:14  96:8 101:11,15 102:11	ankle 80:18	
abdominal 31:13	actions 66:10 150:22		ankles 137:15 140:20	
abilities 145:3	151:6	138:10,16 139:16 141:15,19 144:22,25	149:13,15,21,25	
<b>ability</b> 23:12 75:2 150:1	active 19:3 24:6,12	145:8,19,23 147:17	<b>annual</b> 130:19	
abnormal 76:18	50:13	ahead 98;4	answers 49:14 56:6,13	
abrasions 41:11	activity 137:20 add 143:2	air 33:9,17 75:23	anticipated 137:3	
abreast 50:14	add 143:2 additional 32:18 40:1	<b>airway</b> 76:16 138:13, 20 139:7	apparently 132:23	
absent 92:17,18	80:21,23 133:14	airways 34:12	Appeals 107:17	
absolute 49:24	address 90:4	alcohol 79:3	appearance 34:11	
absolutely 27:21	addressed 105:11	alleged 113:10	appeared 64:13 65:5	
51:17 75:25 81:18 85:10,13	132:22	Allegheny 106:22,25	82:12	
abstract 82:19	adequate 138:11,18	alterations 15:13	<b>appears</b> 29:4,18,21 35:4 40:2 41:17 99:2	
academy 50:18,19	adjunct 103:14 104:2, 5	altercation 79:11	appendages 140:25	
51:4,8 91:7	adopted 85:21 105:8 107:1	alternative 92:19	applicable 47:13	
accept 52:8 66:5 67:7		America 84:3 109:10,	application 99:11	
76:4 78:19 79:8 86:8 87:2 96:9 98:24 117:6	adrenal 33:2 143:5	20	applied 101:17	
136:23 139:16 147:4	adults 89:3 90:1	American 45:18 46:17	<b>apply</b> 115:2	
acceptable 71:20	advance 115:19,20,24	47:17 48:24 50:17 51:4,8 57:16 82:9 91:7	appointed 107:3	
accepted 44:25 66:24	116:2,4,6 adverse 111:14	109:19 110:14,21	116:13	
67:2,5,13 84:1,7 95:14	adverse 111:14 advertise 131:20	Americans 68:20,23	<b>appointments</b> 104:15 106:8	
accepting 101:13 accident 92:22	advised 74:11	amount 36:3 49:8 151:13	approach 151:4	
	advised 74:11	amphetamine 68:1	approaching 74:16	
accidental 62:20	affiliation 45:24 46:4	79:2	approval 116:15	
accidently 69:19	112:7	amphetamines 68:6	approximately 119:8	
12:19,25	afternoon 103:21	<b>AMS</b> 135:2	approximation	
account 130:15	<b>age</b> 99:22	<b>analog</b> 150:18	120:14	
accountant 130:17	agencies 84:2 102:2	analysis 15:22 21:4,	<b>area</b> 125:24 143:12,13 151:5	
accurate 18:16 87:13	105:7 116:4 150:17 agency 106:8 116:3	19,23 23:13 24:2 25:23 26:25 33:19 41:20	areas 33:15 51:12 59:4	
		44:25 57:7 102:18		

arguable 55:17 68:25 arguably 49:25 argue 149:16

Arnold 57:8

arrangements 18:4,

arrest 138:8,25

arrested 11:18

**arrhythmia** 68:10,13, 17 69:13,15 78:16 94:5

arrive 38:17 55:16

arrived 125:20

**arteries** 92:22 142:1 143:8

article 45:11,12 47:24 48:9,18 54:9,17,20 55:24 56:4,8,14 57:14 82:12,14 84:15,24 87:3 88:3,15,20 89:1,17,23 92:18 93:24 94:20,25 95:2 100:12 101:14 104:22 105:2

articles 44:24 46:12,22 47:2,3 48:6,25 49:17 51:15,23 52:15 53:23 54:23,24 56:23 59:1 83:17 95:11 104:19,24 105:3,10 117:12

Asbridge 134:10

aspect 73:8

**asphyxia** 56:19 57:2 58:3,10 70:23 80:12 81:3,4 82:15 85:7 95:23 102:22 137:7 138:10 141:4,21 142:7 143:4

asphyxiate 81:9

**asphyxiation** 76:15 78:5 82:25 95:22 137:9,10,21,24 139:9, 15

assess 72:5.6

**assessing** 73:22,25 74:1

assessment 71:25 assigned 16:20

assist 9:13

**assistant** 9:14,15,17, 20

Associates 130:15

**association** 45:21,23 46:2 58:6 66:18 67:10 102:3 109:10,19 110:1, 15,21

associations 110:12

**assume** 18:2 38:4 152:12

assure 100:1

**asthma** 34:4,6 77:24 124:7 142:9,15

**asthmatic** 77:21 124:9 142:13,19,24 144:5

astronomy 49:25

atherosclerosis 92:21 142:1

**ATLA** 110:24

attack 136:14

attempt 123:12

attend 110:24

attended 111:2,5

attending 28:19

attest 38:11

attorney 11:3 33:10,12 41:2 108:13 116:10 118:4 126:8,10,11,20 148:22

Attorney's 107:21

attorneys 19:15 52:15 103:9,19,22 108:8 109:16 110:12,13,15 115:14 116:5,8,13 119:10,21 122:21 131:5

attributable 63:13

attribute 65:11 102:22 144:19 146:18

attributed 35:10 69:2 145:17 150:22

auditory 62:5

**August** 21:16 22:14,18 42:9,11 43:6 126:12,15 134:9

auscultation 72:12

author 60:3.9

authoritative 48:3,6,7 49:15 50:8

authority 47:18,21 48:19 51:20 58:22

authorization 10:23 11:2.5

**authors** 48:7 69:5 86:2 87:25 93:16 96:9 105:16 117:11 140:10

authors' 54:25

autolysis 33:23

autolyzed 15:12

autopsied 23:5

**autopsies** 7:24 9:19 28:20 52:21 97:8 103:8,20 118:3 119:22 130:22 131:4,18,19

autopsy 7:18 8:3,14, 17 9:4,13,22 10:3,24 11:20,21 12:3,8,14 13:10,14,17,22,24 14:2,3,10,24 15:9,19 16:7,12,16,17,23,25 18:5,12 19:11,23 20:3, 7,15,23 22:21 24:10 26:13,24 28:4,5,13,19 31:8,9,10,22,24,25 32:4 33:5,7 35:23 36:1, 7,9,12 41:13,14 43:10 52:25 69:8,9 78:1 93:20 124:12,21 128:1, 2 129:6,8,9 144:10

**average** 81:19 117:22, 25 118:12 119:4,12

**aware** 53:22 63:20 64:7 65:18 66:12 67:5, 12 69:21 86:7 88:11 98:23 103:3 110:11

122:25 124:10 127:13 144:25 145:13,22 147:5 149:20 151:5

awful 97:5

В

back 19:5 22:1 32:19 44:25 45:9 52:13 53:22 80:6,22,23 90:13,17 93:6 99:12,25 110:23, 25 118:8 123:6,8 132:25 135:21 140:22 152:1

**background** 14:9 19:9

bad 63:6

baled 61:7

**Ballin** 121:20,21,25

**Baptist** 42:15,22 43:2, 12 71:11 123:25

base 52:17

**based** 15:18,22 18:23 42:2,3 45:6 56:8 57:11 70:6 78:1,4 82:7 86:1,4 87:22 93:4

**basically** 31:20 65:3 143:6

**basics** 11:14

**basis** 96:25

batch 134:15,18 135:9

baton 139:12

bear 10:25

**bearing** 126:15 127:9 128:6

bearings 125:16

beat 94:10

beating 77:1

begin 146:11

beginning 41:10 97:17 113:3 114:13

**begins** 41:18

**behave** 108:6

behavior 63:7 147:13

behavioral 11:15

behaviors 146:16

beings 75:18

belated 7:14

belief 86:22

benefit 55:8

Beta-

phenethylamine

24:4,19

biased 107:19

Bible 52:7,8

big 87:10 141:11

bigger 59:9

bile 23:18

bills 116:7

binding 80:17

birthday 7:12,14

**bit** 31:19 64:1 96:13 100:6 141:13 149:21

bizarre 146:15 147:13

bladder 33:2

blends 127:15

block 74:7

blockage 81:21

blocking 76:16

**blood** 23:2,6,10,17,18 62:2,14 71:14

**board** 44:12,13 45:3 46:7,21 50:21,24 51:25 82:11 84:20,21,22 88:4,23,25 91:15 111:18 112:14 117:4,7

boards 44:14

**bodies** 33:13

**body** 9:24,25 10:10,15, 20 14:11 22:23 23:5, 10,19,23 27:24 31:18 32:6,7,10,12,13,24 33:5,6,8 77:8 85:5

90:22 101:21 102:12 143:14 146:20 150:5

**body's** 82:5

bono 108:19

bony 35:4

**book** 54:10 57:20 58:24 59:2,5,7,9,16,19 60:9 100:18,19,20,22 140:8 147:10

**books** 52:14 53:9,10, 11,23 58:25 59:10,11, 13,16,18 67:7

**bottom** 8:23 27:11 38:23 91:6 99:8

**bound** 140:16 146:20, 25 149:25

Boy 100:10

**Brad** 148:25 149:6 152:22

**brain** 22:25 31:13 33:1 47:12 81:13 94:12,13 138:3,4 144:12

**brand** 85:22

Branson 57:17

break 61:4,6,8

breakdown 80:19 130:16

breaking 150:21

**breathe** 65:1 75:3,9, 15,22 76:5 146:19,24

breathing 64:18 71:8, 12 72:3,16 74:12 75:6 76:12 77:4 100:1 138:11,18

**bring** 108:3 123:11 130:6 151:12

bringing 123:12

bronchial 34:9 142:8

bronchiectasis 34:6 142:9

bronchioles 142:20

**bronchitis** 142:5,10 143:11 144:2

brought 77:11 113:23 137:15 140:18 149:15, 21

building 69:24

bullet 135:23 136:15

**bullets** 135:14

burking 139:4

C

calculate 77:6

call 7:25 42:3

**called** 59:5 126:19 148:3

calls 118:4

Canadian 67:9,10

car 63:11

carbon 82:2 97:22

**Carboxy** 24:4,8,13

cardiac 68:9,16 69:13, 15 76:23 77:13 78:16 94:5 95:4 99:9 137:20 138:5 143:18

cardiologist 125:20

cardiology 125:12

cardiorespiratory 77:2,11 138:8,25

**cardiovascular** 97:23 99:3 142:4

**care** 42:10,16 72:14,20 73:11,17 124:4,13

**Carlow** 7:23 104:10, 13,14

cars 145:3

**case** 8:3 9:12 10:1,2 16:4 23:11,18 27:1 28:17 42:6 44:8 50:2 52:24 53:19 54:1,13,16 56:2,10,24 65:24 68:11 69:6 71:6 73:8,10,16 81:2,6,7 82:2,8 83:6,13 85:11 90:5 96:23 97:1 98:7 102:14,19 104:20, 23 107:18 108:19 109:5,7 111:4 113:5,9, 11,25 114:9 115:2,10, 24 116:18 117:15,20 118:9,18 121:7,16,17, 20 122:7 123:13,16,19 124:5 127:10,17,23 128:7,11 133:5 135:19 137:1,11 140:13 143:7, 9,22 145:25 147:22 148:1,6 150:3,6,8,19

cases 52:15 57:22 58:20 59:20 62:12 63:22 67:23 69:18,21 75:20 78:23,25 79:5,6 80:1,15,20,24 81:22 85:10,12 90:14 93:25 97:7 103:23 114:25 115:21 116:6 117:6,23 118:3,10,23 119:2,13, 21,25 120:6,13,15 121:3,5,13,24 139:11 145:23

categorize 145:24

caught 57:6

**caused** 55:12 63:3 94:3 137:8

cell 136:16

**central** 68:1 79:1 112:20

cerebral 92:22,23 143:5

certainty 78:7

certificates 69:9

certified 112:14 117:5,

cessation 81:11 138:11,18,23,25 139:1,

chain 94:11 150:1

**chairman** 112:5 113:6, 12

Chan 100:25 101:14

chance 13:17 92:17

change 34:7,11 44:6

changed 47:25 149:14 characterize 30:18 characterized 63:19 charge 35:24 36:2,3,9 115:24 **charged** 113:13 charges 36:3 107:21 114:8 check 36:6 45:9 114:15 151:12,17 chemistry 49:25 chest 72:5,17 139:10 Chicago 135:25 chiefs 102:4 140:12 choice 146:22 chose 19:14 23:1 chronic 77:21 142:8,9 chronological 18:24 38:13 CHW 15:11 16:4 circle 135:15 circles 63:12 Circuit 107:17 circular 77:8 circumstances 64:20 82:8 citation 45:9 57:12 cite 37:21 41:1 53:15, 18 56:3 86:22 98:23 104:21,24 105:2 cited 55:24 59:19 City 69:25

civil 58:19 103:23

109:5 110:13 112:21 113:5,11 117:20,23

119:25 120:6,12,15

classical 137:11,16

121:3,7

civilly 121:14

Clark 145:20

classified 62:3 classify 145:23 claustrophobiic 63:11 clear 43:22 70:21 71:18 97:8 107:11 148:17 150:7 **clever** 72:25 client 116:11 148:18 **clients** 115:16 clinical 14:9 36:19 38:3,20,25 39:4,19,23 40:9 42:3 43:2 53:12 104:4 112:8,14 clinically 93:8 101:6, clinician 125:19 **close** 19:2 107:10 136:17 closed 76:11 112:6,18, 19 **clothing** 146:13 co-author 100:21 **co-counsel** 108:18 CO2 76:8 cocaine 66:15 68:1.6 79:1 code 126:19 coded 76:19 collapse 97:23 99:3 collapses 139:2 collateral 38:5 colleague 112:24 113:8,13 colleagues 52:6 86:8, 17 collective 40:15 114:20 129:1 collectively 40:11,12

component 26:2,15

College 57:16 components 143:7 collocate 47:9 compounds 68:3 colloquially 63:6 compression 138:13, 20 139:7,8 color 76:18 comprised 51:9 column 90:20 91:17 109:16 110:3 93:2 95:19 97:12 compromise 71:24 combative 64:13 72:6 75:10 77:4,12 82:1,25 146:24 147:1 83:20 85:7 86:14 95:22 combativeness 75:20 137:19 138:4.13.20 79:24 139:5 142:2,3 combination 138:14, compromised 76:13 21 146:18 147:8 compromises 101:21 combined 118:2 concentration 27:4,5, commenced 9:7 12,24 comment 11:25 45:15 concentrations 62:14 61.21,23 72:7 73:13 concern 33:11 70:8 74:6 83:11 86:15 87:8 81:3 101:24 concerned 15:16 commented 57:4 31:18 119:14 76:10 concert 11:14 comments 18:20 45:1, 11,16 51:14 73:7,10 conclude 17:10 35:11 101:25 82:23 93:5 committee 109:19,22. concluded 18:20 80:2 81:3 88:9 committing 69:18 concluding 92:25 communicate 37:24 conclusion 13:18,19, comp 117:24 22 15:19,23 17:7,20,24 company 115:16 27:23 29:23 30:2 42:2 55:17 65:24 76:22,24 comparable 92:1 85:24 87:4 99:15 compared 89:12 99:10 101:11 104:23 conclusions 26:18 competent 67:14 38:17 45:13 51:16 complaint 111:17 52:23 84:25 88:5 99:8 102:13 complete 12:20 80:17 90:18,19,24 138:17 condensed 152:13,17 completed 9:8 condition 64:12 77:21 completely 107:22 124:10 142:8,14,24 144:5,20 comply 123:12

conditions 81:16

17

141:20 142:19 143:1,2,

80:23 90:11 147:3

conduct 102:24 103:4 conducted 58:9 86:22 97:4 127:2 conducting 127:14

confer 145:2 confidential 30:16

confirmed 124:7 126:20,21 127:11,12

confluence 23:9

confronted 86:25

**confused** 60:14 122:9 148:12

confusion 147:14

**conjunction** 56:2,23 149:9

conjunctiva 34:15

connection 44:22

connotes 88:10

consequence 26:3

consideration 105:12

**considered** 52:2 65:9 79:16 93:10,17 131:25 147:3

**consistent** 38:8 78:15 79:22 83:8,11 92:12 98:7,14 125:18,25 127:15 129:25

constrict 142:21

consult 53:3

consultant 120:13

consultation 52:25

**consultations** 103:22 120:5 130:13 131:7

**consulted** 54:20 117:19 118:16,17,20 120:1

consumed 135:18

contact 36:23

contacted 10:13 11:10

contention 97:20

**contents** 141:7,9

contiguous 141:1

continue 90:15

continues 92:8

Continuing 135:23

contractor 103:11

contracts 116:9

contrary 96:23,25

contribute 64:1

contributed 26:19

control 138:4

controlled 100:8

controlling 94:13

**controversial** 90:23 91:3,4,5

contusions 41:11

conversation 123:21

convicted 111:10

copied 13:2

**copies** 12:20 21:6 39:9 151:21,25 152:16

cops 100:3

**copy** 13:5 16:25 38:25 39:2 55:3,19 82:16 100:25 113:19,22 116:15 126:12 132:7, 15,18 136:3 151:25 152:2,8,12,17,21

copying 13:1

copyright 91:7

cord 32:21

**coronary** 92:22 142:1 143:8

**coroner** 105:24 106:1, 6,10,14,16,21,25

coroner's 28:15

**coroners** 103:9,19 106:17,18,19

**correct** 8:4,7,15 9:2 20:17 21:16 27:16

55:25 62:25 83:24 88:23 90:1,2 92:15,16 95:5 98:2 99:14 112:20 113:17 122:14 132:16 137:2 144:8,14,17 150:2,9 151:1

**correctly** 15:17 91:21 93:12,13 96:6 98:10,18 99:6,13 101:14,23 136:22 139:14

correctness 98:25

correlation 42:4

correspondence 13:13 128:13,17,25

corroborated 126:17

corroborative 125:19

costs 36:5

counsel 13:14 108:22 131:25 133:11 151:1

counties 103:9

**country** 51:5 102:2 105:7 106:4

counts 107:15

County 106:22,25

couple 11:19 17:15 22:17 30:22 32:16,18 33:16 37:13 59:10 68:24 70:2 77:14 81:22 106:18 118:10,23 121:11 129:8

coursed 140:22

**court** 107:17 108:4,18, 20 116:14,15 121:7,9 122:4 151:20,22 152:5, 19

court's 116:15

**cover** 21:17 100:19 103:15

**covered** 123:20 128:10 129:15 151:3,5

**covering** 21:13 36:7 42:7,25 43:9,13

covers 139:3

credibility 51:24

crime 111:10,12

**criminal** 58:19 103:23 109:7 117:20,23

criteria 79:19

criticizing 140:6

current 103:6 113:19

custody 11:20 82:15 85:8

**CV** 7:11 44:16 46:11 57:8 109:9,24 110:7,8 111:9

cyanide 94:7

cycle 94:14 138:3,6

Cyril 7:3,10 130:15

D

daily 134:16

damage 81:13

Dana 100:21

darn 19:1

data 131:24

date 8:4,8,15,18 9:2 10:25 17:4 18:7 22:12 25:2,9,12 27:22 29:6 31:23 55:19 125:9 127:5 147:24

dated 8:10 16:2 17:13 27:8 30:12 36:10,13,15 42:8,11 125:14 126:11 134:9

**David** 55:5 60:3,4 125:8 126:11 133:22

**Davis** 116:21

**day** 10:17 18:25 22:16 42:13 100:11 109:3

**days** 10:15,20 17:9,16 22:17 23:14,16 128:1

**DEA** 62:2

**deal** 19:19 73:8 82:7 108:11

**dealing** 74:17 78:4 79:14 143:6

dealings 117:6

**dealt** 57:3 67:23 79:5 143:17

death 13:19,22 14:1 15:8,16,20,24 17:7,21 23:14,15 26:1,19 27:2, 25 29:23 41:24,25 42:2 48:22 55:12,18 62:18 68:17 69:9,14,17 70:20 77:11,19 78:15 79:18 80:3 83:1 86:21 90:6,8, 14,20,22 92:19 93:18 94:4,7,9 98:17 102:1 137:1,6 138:8 140:9

**deaths** 57:7,15 68:24 79:9 83:9 90:12 93:10 98:8 140:1 145:2

decade 85:21

decedent 36:8

**December** 8:10 9:1 16:2 17:13,16 19:21,25 20:14 25:14 27:8 28:24 29:24 30:21 31:2,6 36:11,13,16 38:18 41:9 53:14 54:4 70:1 74:2

decomposition 33:24 34:10

decreased 99:4

decreases 101:18

decrement 97:22

**deemed** 28:17

Defendants 149:7

defenders 116:14

**defense** 108:7 110:12, 13,16,18 115:14 116:18 117:15,17 120:4,12,16,24 121:11

**Define** 137:10

defined 89:17

**definition** 83:10 106:1, 3 138:9 139:14,21 141:16

**definitive** 15:7 49:20 64:3

degree 78:6 93:8 146:9

delayed 79:18

delineate 47:11

delineation 134:11

deliria 145:12 146:17

delirium 58:15 66:3,5, 20,24 67:17,20,24 78:4,16,20 79:8,16,20, 22,24 80:3 83:12 86:9, 11,16 94:1 136:24 144:20 145:1,18,24 147:4,5,11,18,20

Delta-9 24:4,7,8,12,13

delusional 66:9

demands 89:2 93:8

dentures 143:20

**department** 43:8 64:23 72:1 74:25 80:7, 9 84:10 112:6 113:7

depend 146:9

depending 141:24

**depends** 146:12

depict 139:18

depicting 136:19

deposed 113:2

deposition 11:7 13:6 22:6 40:18 54:7 88:17 94:22 100:14 102:8 108:19 114:4,13,16,21 115:6 120:22 123:2,4, 10 124:18 126:24 127:20 129:2,12 130:3 132:11 133:23 148:4 152:15,24

**depositions** 44:7 115:19,23 119:2,6 120:15,18 130:13

deprivation 137:24 142:17

deprived 94:12

derive 130:19

derogatory 67:9

describe 14:25

description 10:6 15:18

designated 30:5,13

despicable 108:4

detached 32:14,22

detail 12:1 107:13

detailed 44:4

detectives 28:19

**determine** 33:21 34:10 42:21 45:12

determined 101:1

**determining** 15:7,15 27:1

develop 62:10

device 149:24

diagnosis 66:5,13 77:25 78:20 80:5 113:14 136:24,25 144:23

diagnostic 71:23

diaphragm 141:8,14

dictate 28:10

dictated 8:16

**die** 79:12,13 81:4 82:3 93:22,23 94:4,16,17,19 137:18

**died** 11:18 76:22,24 77:1,3 92:24 94:2 97:9 99:19

Diego 84:10

dies 76:25 79:7

diethylamide 62:1

**differ** 31:9,12,16 47:21 51:17 59:2

**difference** 30:19,24 38:9,10 65:23 87:10 105:23,25 149:10

**differences** 48:16 50:1 106:5

differentiation 149:18

difficult 47:20 65:1

**difficulty** 64:17 71:8, 12,19 72:11,16 75:6

dilated 147:16

**Dillard** 31:23 32:1 149:1,5,6 151:9 152:22

**Dimaio** 59:6,8,10,24 100:18,22 102:6

**Dimaio's** 59:13,19 101:11

diminished 138:3,4 142:22

diminution 137:24 138:6 139:5 142:16

dioxide 97:22

direct 90:17

directly 37:11,25 127:11

director 9:18

**disagree** 35:12,20 48:9 58:23 83:15,17,24 88:5,14 105:16

disagreed 108:13

disagreement 35:16 48:20

disagrees 102:12

discern 72:15

discernible 33:25

disclosure 8:12

disclosures 116:18

discoloration 31:19 76:21

discoverable 29:13

**discussed** 19:7 26:17 66:25 144:18 145:25 150:25

discussing 33:23

**discussion** 19:9 70:11 90:7,20 134:22 148:2,5

disease 33:19 85:13

141:22,23,25 142:17 143:24 144:1

diseases 142:6

disguise 145:20

disk 127:25

disorientation 147:15

disproved 105:14

**dispute** 96:14,17,19 98:20 99:15

disrupting 64:22

dissected 32:19

distinction 96:12

distinguished 104:11, 13

distress 75:14

**district** 103:8,19 116:5 118:3 119:10,21 131:5

ditch 81:24

divers 81:17

doctor 12:19 36:12 39:14 42:9 44:8 46:11 61:5 75:24 84:13 94:25 102:11 110:11 113:20 123:10 127:24 141:15 149:6 150:7 151:12

doctor's 18:6,13

doctors 150:13

**document** 10:22 29:2 39:6,9,18 40:5 46:15

documented 78:20

documents 40:15 124:2 134:4

dogs 136:15

Dolinak 60:3,5,6,9

domain 150:15

door 107:8,10 108:5

dose 62:16

doubt 54:12

dozen 118:5,11 119:9

draft 30:13,15

drawing 23:13

drawn 22:21,23

driven 33:9,16

drooling 147:15

**dropped** 71:14,15,17 107:22 110:6 112:24 113:1

drug 24:20 62:4

drugs 23:23 24:21 68:7

**due** 62:18 64:19,24,25 65:3,9

dues 46:6

duly 7:4

duplicative 40:3

**Duquesne 1**03:14 104:16

Ε

**E-TRAN** 151:25

e.g. 101:4

earlier 10:17 19:22 20:5,23 29:22 71:7 82:9 100:17 104:20 118:24 132:6,14 149:20

early 29:24 31:19 33:23 34:10 89:17 117:21

easily 64:18

eastern 9:5

easy 118:21

eaten 141:10

ECG 77:15,16,17 78:9

editor 44:10,13 47:22 48:4 88:13,23,24

editor-in-chief 52:1

editorial 44:12,14,17, 21 45:3 46:7,14 50:21, 24 51:25 82:11 84:20, 21,22 88:4,23,25 91:15 editorially 98:2

editors 44:13

Edwards 8:11 10:15 11:11 12:12 13:9,12 16:3,22 17:13 18:2,14. 18 19:8,14 20:15 21:12,16 25:12,14 28:25 29:4,10,12 30:3, 7 31:4,6 32:3 36:6,13, 15,21,25 37:11,17,20 38:20 39:1,5,12 40:10 42:8 43:3,5,6,7,19 55:4 56:7,22 61:14 70:11,18 72:18 84:9 102:15 104:25 115:5 121:17, 19 123:22 124:12 125:13,15 126:4,10 127:4 128:14,18 132:2, 20.25 135:4 136:2.18 137:3 146:3 148:3,13, 17 151:3,24 152:4,7,10

**Edwards'** 70:15 128:3 134:10

**effect** 63:21,25 64:5 77:13 95:2 96:4,15 116:13 125:22

**effects** 62:6,10,18 63:5,17 64:18 66:8 137:20

egocentricity 52:20

**EKGS** 78:8

election 106:6 107:2

**electronic** 133:4,8,9 151:21,25 152:11,17

email 42:11,12 43:6 134:9,10 135:14 136:11

embalmed 10:10 23:20

embalmer 9:19

**emergency** 64:12 72:1 74:24 80:7,9 87:7,9 95:9 145:14 148:22

emotional 97:6

emphysema 34:2 142:11,12 144;2 emphysematous 34:7

employment 111:21

EMS 77:9 150:13

encephalopathy

encountered 63:21 68:5

end 17:15 29:20,24 41:12 54:2

endeavor 133:24

ended 112:17

enforcement 85:16 105:7,22 150:17,19

engage 97:3

English 78:9

enhanced 64:19

enhancing 65:4

**ensues** 75:9

ensure 45:5

entire 64:22 139:18 146:19

entirety 21:18,20,25

entitled 89:1

environment 146:10

epidemiologic 98:21

epidemiological 98:15

epidemiology 104:6

epiglottic 143:12

epithets 146:22

equivocating 88:2

**ER** 64:21

erratic 63:7

error 29:25 101:2

errors 30:9

erudite 55:15

esoteric 50:11

estimate 69:8 117:18 119:1,16 130:10,18 131:9,11

essence 70:7 71:6

estimated 68:23 estimating 118:15

et al 101:1,14

etcetera 148:4

etiological 139:19

etiology 142:19

European 67:11

evaluate 14:17 113:15

evaluated 81:2

evaluating 93:10

event 19:9 76:23

**events** 37:6 38:14 94:11 134:11

evidence 34:4,8,16,19 35:5 77:12 85:5 89:13, 24 91:18 92:13 101:7 143:23 144:10,15

evident 144:13

evidently 83:25 84:7 105:21

exacerbation 142:13

exact 111:6

exam 8:13 16:9

**examination** 31:16 150:25

examinations 15:1

examined 7:4

**examiner** 17:1 19:24 20:3 28:15 35:8 105:24 106:7 107:1,3 111:24

examiner's 128:2

**examiners** 45:23 46:2 57:16 66:18 106:3

exceed 62:12

excerpts 102:7

excitation 66:11 79:24

excited 58:15 66:3,5, 19,24 67:16,20,24 78:3,16,19 79:8,16,19, 20,22,23 80:3 83:12 86:8,10,16 94:1 136:24 144:20 145:1,12,18,24 146:17 147:3,4,11,18, 20

excluded 122:3

excluding 119:20

Excuse 7:20 146:3

exercise 101:4

exhibit 11:6,7 12:18 13:6 14:25 22:4,6,10 28:4 40:13,15,18 88:16,17 94:21,22 100:13,14 102:7,8 114:3,4,20,21 123:3,4 124:17,18 126:23,24 127:19,20 128:19 129:1,2,11,12 130:2,3 131:24 132:10,11 134:5 152:24

**exhibits** 151:20 152:1,

exhortations 75:11

exist 80:25

exiting 54:7

**expect** 111:8

expensive 33:10

**experience** 52:18 65:22 75:13 78:4 79:10

experienced 62:10 67:14 69:16

experiencing 141:3 143:3

experimental 97:3

experimenting 69:23

experiments 101:1

expert 55:5 59:24 110:22 111:3,7 116:18 117:19 118:16 119:3

120:1 122:3 125:6,13 130:7,12,20 131:10,20 150:11 experts 117:14,16

explain 87:19 94:15

explains 30:2

**explanation** 92:19 99:19

explode 65:10

exposed 23:7

expounded 67:24

**express** 48:6 50:2 78:6 122:17 131:8,12 150:12,14

**expressed** 56:10 58:25 60:23 84:24 147:7

expressing 47:23 150:20

expressions 66:9

expressly 83:22

extensive 102:24

extent 45:16 52:17

External 31:16

Externally 34:15

extra 49:9 100:25

extras 113:23

**extremely** 50:11 64:13,15

eye 14:14 57:6

eyes 34:16,20

F

face 101:3 137:13

faced 145:14

facial 34:21

fact 20:14 26:6 38:10 59:19 62:24 69:22 75:5 85:19 87:11 90:6 92:5 105:5 111:22 127:11

factor 90:22

factors 65:4 83:1 93:9 139:19 facts 38:4 40:4 131:24

faculty 104:8,15

**failure** 77:2,11 93:9 144:16

fair 49:8 96:12

fairly 54:14

fall 118:7 142:5 150:15

familiar 59:5,7,11 60:2,16 102:25 121:23

families 103:20

family 11:21

famous 85:11

**fashion** 76:9 81:21 137:5 146:20,25

fast 30:23 94:14

fatal 69:13

father 81:24

fax 10:25

February 126:3

federal 29:13 84:2 105:8 107:14,20 108:20

fee 113:19,24 114:24 115:4 116:16

feel 145:4

feeling 63:10

fees 114:12,25 115:8

feet 139:12 140:16,17, 18

felony 107:15

felt 25:24,25 53:24

field 45:14 48:15,16 50:13 51:2,13,19,22 55:5 59:25 84:23 85:25 93:11 95:8 98:7 113:9

fields 45:4 51:10

**figures** 81:14

**file** 12:20 129:5 132:16 133:4,8

filed 111:17 112:21

**files** 40:1 133:9

fill 76:2,5

filling 76:7

film 136:16,18

filming 136:17

**final** 17:19,24 30:18 51:25 77:10 133:1

finalized 17:16 19:2

finally 107:16

**find** 13:24 26:24 27:12 33:18 34:1,2,13,21,24 35:14 44:3 105:1 143:23 144:1,10,15

**finding** 35:13 98:21 99:16 145:22

findings 15:6,19 24:22 26:22 28:24 29:16 41:13,25 42:1 83:25 92:9 96:21 97:19 98:6, 13 101:15 103:3 124:12

finds 75:17

fine 107:8 108:1,11

finish 128:16 133:14

finishing 118:8

fired 111:20

firm 108:21,22 114:15 121:18 128:18

five-vear 112:11

fixed 120:9

Flashback 62:9

flexed 137:15

floridly 65:5

flow 142:4,22

flows 130:22 131:5,18

fluid 23:9

fluids 22:24

foaming 147:15

folder 128:23 129:18

folks 112:8

follow-ups 119:22

**force** 93:6 95:4 97:21 98:15 99:5,12 101:20

forensic 45:4,18 46:17 47:17 48:15,24 49:23 50:16,18 51:4,5,8,10, 11 52:13,18 55:13 57:9,16 58:19 59:6 60:2,10,12 67:2,14,15 78:7 82:10 86:4,18,20, 24 87:5,9,12 88:21 91:8,11 95:1,8,14 99:17 100:18 103:8 106:2,4,17,20 112:15 116:22,24 117:3,5,7

Forget 81:17 94:7

forgive 55:23

**form** 18:14 55:10 70:16 72:18

forming 131:25

fort 49:18

found 38:12 43:22 55:14 65:2,17 73:4 78:23 91:18 93:20 95:24 98:16 101:2 144:4

foundation 105:6

four-point 149:9,11,13

fractures 35:2,6,8,12, 13,15,17

**Francis** 112:19

frequently 79:2

fresh 23:18

Friedman 135:24

friends 11:15 108:24

frightening 75:16

frigid 81:15

front 12:14 36:16 113:20 129:18

full 95:19 137:11 141:11 150:24

fully 72:6 139:14

function 76:14 96:1

101:6 138:5,14,21

functioning 101:5,19

fundamental 75:7

funded 84:9

funeral 9:18

G

gallbladder 23:18

games 108:16

Gamut 85:11

Gary 117:8

**GASS** 31:2,5 123:6 148:10,15 151:19

gastric 141:9

gathered 135:15

**gave** 27:19 53:7 57:15 67:19 118:13 121:1 131:11,12 134:11

**gee** 69:22 94:3 118:9 121:2 130:23

general 41:20 85:3

**generally** 49:13 56:20 62:3,11 67:3,4

generated 133:2

gentleman 108:6

**gentlemen** 19:16 94:18 126:11 133:12

give 13:25 16:3 27:3 54:10,25 56:3,5 61:7 74:9 81:5,14 83:9 87:2, 20 98:24 103:13 117:18 119:16 120:14 121:4 122:18 151:16,

**giving** 122:6

gland 33:2

God 93:23

good 54:14 61:4 93:19

**Goode** 7:18,20 11:2 12:5 15:12 27:13 29:17 35:24 36:20,24 37:2,6.

10,15,22,24 38:2 62:24 63:2 64:9 71:8,20 72:2 74:23 76:22 77:23 79:21 89:20 97:7 124:3 136:13,20 137:12 140:14 141:15 143:24

**Goode's** 9:22 16:16 27:24 38:19 39:4 55:18 64:11 70:20 78:15 80:6 137:1,6 150:8

Goodman 40:23

governing 113:24

government 69:23 107:14

governmental 106:8 116:3,4

grab 53:8 59:16

Graduate 104:6

gram 24:5

great 52:17 66:11 107:13 145:10 147:12

greater 75:12

greatly 81:10 85:21

Greg 116:21

**gross** 10:6 14:11 15:18 41:13,24 144:15

grossly 34:1 144:4,13

ground 99:23 100:9

group 51:5

groups 67:6,11 85:16

guess 42:12 52:1 110:6 115:13 140:22 149:12

**guidelines** 85:17,19 105:20

guilty 108:20 111:12

guy 71:20 85:12

Н

**Hainey** 127:3

half 9:12 79:13 118:11

hallucinating 63:4 hallucinations 147:14 hallucinatory 65:16 hallucinogen 62:4 63:20 hallucinogenic 63:3, 25 64:4,6 66:9 68:3 hand 128:22 131:6 135:21 handbook 59:6,8,10 handcuffs 140:23 handful 69:3.5 handle 14:7 handled 107:18 143:16 **hands** 140:15,16 handwriting 37:18 **Hang** 126:14 happen 79:10 happened 40:23 41:4 71:21 113:1 122:14,19 happening 139:17 **happy** 7:14 12:18,25 61:7 134:3 hard 59:2 121:4,14 151:21 152:1,2,8,12 harrow 145:4 Haven 57:9 health 72:14,20 73:10 93:19 104:7,17 healthy 71:20 77:20 78:2 85:12 89:3 90:1 91:18 93:4 hear 64:7

heard 64:10

**heavy** 9:23

111:21

held 106:12,15,21

heart 33:1 68:18 76:25

94:10,13 126:18 138:2

141:21,23 143:6,8,24

hell 100:2 helps 9:23 Hemodynamic 95:4 hemorrhage 35:22 41:11 92:23 hemorrhages 34:14. 22.25 **Henry** 57:8 Hepatic 143:5 high 62:16 79:3 135:8 higher 68:22 71:22 143:12 highly 26:2 histopathologic 15:13 histopathologist 14:19 history 38:20 39:4,19, 23 40:9 42:2,3 hobble 95:21 hogtie 95:20 149:19 hogtied 64:16,25 70:25 72:22,24 74:8 77:5 80:16 82:23 84:5 85:7 86:12,21 87:1 94:2 100:3 101:3 102:5 137:12,16 140:14 149:9,11,14,23 hold 25:10 44:21 97:1 103:6.25 106:9 128:7 home 134:14 homicide 116:6 119:21 homicides 119:10 horrific 75:16 hospital 39:10 42:15, 18,19 43:12,14,16 71:11 72:22 73:2,3,6 74:8,14,22 110:15

112:2,5,7,18,19,20

113:8 123:25 126:8

hospitals 112:10,13

127:7 150:13

illusion 62:5 **hour** 9:11 77:5,6 79:13 83:16 imagine 84:14 100:4 hours 11:19 62:12,13, 146:22 15 107:7 133:23 immediately 133:23 151:13 impact 63:2 124:6 housekeeping 151:11,19 **impede** 23:12 **HR** 127:3 impervious 144:24 145:7 147:12 human 75:16,18 important 74:3 93:8 hundreds 57:4 inability 75:15 146:19 husband 77:24 inactive 24:7,8,9,13 Hyper 146:6,7 inadequate 82:5 hyperactivity 147:14 incident 74:10 136:16, hypercapnia 89:14,25 19 hyperflexion 149:15 incision 31:14 35:5 hyperthermia 62:7 incisions 32:18 78:23 79:17 145:21,25 146:4 147:12 include 26:1 42:14,18 62:7 73:19,22,24 118:2 hypo 146:3 147:11 hypothetically 78:21 included 8:19 57:18 79:15 77:7 hypoventilation 85:6 including 26:13 48:11 89:14,25 91:19 92:14 85:16 102:3 income 103:23 130:7, hypoxemia 89:14,25 11,19,21 131:4,9 hypoxia 96:3 101:7 inconsistency 38:12 inconsistent 43:22 ı 44:3 83:5 incorporate 47:9 ice 81:16 incorrect 8:15 47:25 idea 12:10 148:6 increase 85:4 141:20 identical 41:17 142:6 143:3 identification 11:8 increased 141:3 13:7 22:7 40:19 88:18 145:10,17 94:23 100:15 102:9 114:5,22 123:5 124:19 incredible 81:18 126:25 127:21 129:3. independent 18:5,11 13 130:4 132:12 46:3 103:7,11 152:25 independently 125:21 identified 127:3.24 index 152:13 identify 51:20 123:18 indicating 96:2,4,15 illuminating 55:15

indication 33:18 41:24,25 75:2 indicted 107:15 indirectly 69:17,18,25 individual 77:20 85:5 101:2,20 137:12,23 144:24 individuals 67:6 83:2 90:9,15,21 95:21 infarct 34.2 infarction 92:21 infer 132:24 inferred 18:20 influence 69:20 information 11:11,22 14:8 19:8 25:22 36:18, 19 37:5,9,16 38:3,5 43:5 47:9 70:25 87:1 133:5 135:10,17 informational 47:10 infrequently 46:25 ingested 68:20 ingestion 63:14 64:14, 23 65:7,12 66:3 67:16 ingredient 24:6 inherent 97:23 inhibit 138:13.21 initial 20:7 36:11 initially 11:10 112:25 initials 16:7 injection 68:16 injuries 34:19 73:4 input 46:22 instruct 84:3 instructions 85:17,20 insulted 138:2 insurance 115:16 intact 35:4

integral 26:15 intend 53:17 56:2 interactions 136:12 interested 42:21 70:22 interesting 63:23 83:11 93:16 interestingly 79:9 internally 31:13 International 102:3 **interpret** 78:8,12 interpretation 24:11 77:16 78:13 interpreted 15:4 44:2 interview 127:2,5,6 investigating 95:24 139:25 Investigation 57:7 140:8 investigative 90:2 115:23 invoices 114:7.11.19 involve 78:25 80:16 90:15 106:6.7 involved 19:18 57:22 112:24 121:17 involvement 80:21 119:14 **involves** 103:18 involving 90:3 113:9 143:11 irregularly 94:10 ischemic 144:10 isolated 38:9 93:9 issue 135:18 issued 20:12 22:13 102:4 issues 134:15 136:1 items 40:7

Kent 145:20 J Kentucky 116:25 J.D. 7:3 kidney 22:25 33:1 killed 69:19 **January** 55:21 106:13 107:4 111:23 125:10, **kind** 12:1 15:11 20:8,9 14 126:4 24:4 27:20 39:16 47:16 63:21 68:13 75:14 job 94:14 108:14 76:21 98:11 118:12 jobs 103:6 142:16,21 145:16 146:13 149:19 Joe 100:8 kinds 35:17 45:16 Johnny 85:11 48:10 66:8 68:7 78:5 joint 134:14 82:6 90:12 103:22 Joseph 9:14 kneeling 101:20 journal 44:22 45:3,18 knees 137:16 139:12 46:3,17,20,25 47:4,15, knew 14:2,4 70:18 16,17 48:4,18,24 49:3, 126:18,21 11,13 50:4,16,25 51:13 52:4,6,14 53:5,6 56:3 knowing 27:24 58:5,13 60:10,19,21 knowledge 49:6 63:18 82:9 84:15 85:25 87:5. 81:1 111:19 122:5 12 88:21,22 91:11 95:1 134:25 136:7,9 99:17 journals 44:11 45:6 L 47:1,10,19 51:19,22 52:9 53:12,13 58:1,2 60:23 61:2 83:16 88:12 lab 23:24 95:15 label 129:7 judge 107:18,20 labeled 15:11 44:16 122:12,16 laboratory 26:22 judge's 122:21 72:23 135:3 136:8 judicial 122:23,24 lady 99:24 **July** 8:4,7,9,13,16,18 landslide 81:22 9:2 10:17,19 11:1 12:3 16:15,19 22:21 31:8 language 100:4 32:1,2,3 35:24 37:7 large 98:14,20 141:3 42:23 62:24 127:4,5 146:9 jumped 69:24 larger 28:15 jumping 29:19 86:16 largest 51:5 June 107:22 law 48:12 85:16 103:15 104:17 105:6.22 108:4. Κ 21 121:18 122:23 150:16,19 Keith 127:2 lawsuit 113:3 134:12 Kelli 134:15 136:16 lawyer 108:17 109:1,5

122:12 148:18

lawyer's 122:24

lawyers 109:10,20 110:1,4,21 148:14

lay 88:12

**lead** 66:10 68:17 69:17 86:21 139:1

leading 25:25 52:23 55:18 78:16

leads 96:3 138:5

learn 12:2 50:9

leave 12:21

lecture 57:10,11

lectures 57:24 58:6

led 105:13

Lee 57:9 140:11

**left** 41:12 89:6 108:13 134:16

left-hand 93:2

**legal** 19:20 40:5 45:4 48:16 60:10,12 88:11 95:1 109:2 117:20

legs 137:14

length 149:8 150:1,5

lengthy 115:23

let alone 48:12 88:12

letter 8:10,12,20 16:2 20:14 21:13,17 25:13 28:23,24 29:1,6,8 30:20 36:7,13,15,23 37:19 39:7 40:25 54:4 100:25 101:8,16 116:12 126:9,12,14 132:7,15,19

**letters** 47:22 88:13 129:8

level 71:16,22 72:9 82:4 135:8

levels 62:16 79:3 105:8,22

license 109:2 111:15

licensed 9:18

licensing 111:18

licked 135:21

**lie** 91:25 100:8,9 137:22

life 29:11 38:2

lift 145:3

lifting 9:24

likewise 144:14

limited 77:17 84:21 143:18 150:8

**limiting** 149:15

**lines** 31:14 37:8,13,14 38:6

lingering 65:25

lining 34:12

liquid 135:16

list 9:3 32:23 46:12,14 70:1 142:5 143:2 144:22 145:24 147:17, 20

**listed** 41:10 44:19 69:7,10 108:22 109:23, 24 111:9 125:5

listen 72:11

**listing** 41:17

lists 8:14

literally 69:4 145:3

literature 53:15,18 54:19 55:25 56:19 67:3,15 68:25 69:11 95:8 102:12,20

litigation 118:18

liver 22:2,24,25 23:1, 22 33:1 53:9 141:9,12

living 73:20,22,25 112:9

local 84:2 105:8

locate 61:12

logical 19:13

long 9:10,15 69:22 81:8 82:3 103:2 109:12 110:17 140:21 146:12

longer 74:12 81:16 82:2

looked 84:24 95:12 128:5

lost 89:8 98:11

lot 9:24 19:3 52:7,12 72:21 73:3 84:8 97:5 100:2 132:3

love 93:18,21 107:8,9

lower 140:25

LSD 11:17 26:18 27:4, 12,23,24 54:11,21,23 55:1,5,8,12,18 56:16 58:13 62:1,2,14,19,24 63:2,5,8,14,17 64:14, 19,23,25 65:3,9,11,15, 18 66:1,3,8 67:16,21 68:8,9,15,16,20,24 69:7,15,17,20 70:8,20 78:3 135:16,18,24 136:3,8

LSD-INDUCED 62:20

lung 33:19 143:13

**lungs** 33:1 75:23 76:2, 3 94:13 143:6,9

lying 99:23 101:21

lysergic 62:1

#### M

**M.D.** 7:3

madam 151:20

made 11:25 18:4,10, 11,20 19:22 24:24 27:23 32:18 62:23 65:13 70:21 71:7 92:2 100:17 113:13 114:8 123:12 149:18

madrases 62:7

mail 22:17

main 33:11

major 52:19,23

majority 84:1 119:13

make 12:18,25 14:11 19:4 20:19,23 25:14, 18,22 27:14 28:5 38:18 40:7 43:21 45:15 48:7 53:3 56:19 58:18 60:19 65:23 73:7 102:19 107:10 113:16 130:14 131:7 134:18 136:2 142:24 148:17

makes 49:20 65:1 145:6

making 30:3 53:25 98:21

malpractice 73:9 74:18 109:19 150:12,

man 11:13 78:2 81:23

man's 27:2

manager 127:3

Mancuso 9:14

Mancuso's 9:16

manifestation 71:18

manifested 64:9

manner 11:23 80:13

marijuana 24:6,15 63:16,18,24 64:4,8,10 134:19 135:1,7,11

mark 11:5 12:17 22:4 40:12 88:15 100:12 102:6 114:2,19 123:2 124:16 126:22 127:18 129:10 130:1 132:9

marked 11:7 13:6 14:24 22:6,10 28:3 40:18 88:17 94:22 100:14 102:8 114:4,21 123:4 124:18 126:24 127:20 128:18,24 129:2,12,22,24 130:3 131:23 132:11,20 134:5 152:25

Markle 57:8

Marty 152:14

material 27:22

materials 115:22 116:17 123:13,15,19 129:10

mathematics 49:24

matter 10:13 18:23 19:18 23:16 52:19 68:19 70:7 75:5 76:13, 15 122:23 132:23 151:12

matters 50:10 78:5

maximal 80:13,15 89:18 95:3 96:16 105:12

maximum 83:19 92:14

Mccormack 13:9

Mcintosh 54:6

MDMA 68:6 79:2

Meaning 14:14

means 51:23 76:9 84:19 138:11,19

measured 101:5

measurements 89:13

Measures 95:5

mechanical 76:15

mechanism 69:14

mechanisms 138:15, 22

medical 17:1 19:24
20:3 26:23 28:15 35:7
39:15 42:6,9 43:1
45:23 46:2 52:14
53:15,18 54:19 62:3
66:18 67:10 71:10 73:8
74:4,10,11,17 76:17
78:7 102:12 104:1,12
105:23 106:3,7 107:1,3
109:18 111:3,15,18,24
113:9 123:24 124:3
128:2 143:17 144:20
150:11,19

medicine 45:4,19 46:17 47:17 48:16,24 49:23 60:11,13 84:23 95:1 104:3,5 125:24 meet 46:21,23 79:19

meeting 115:4

meetings 58:7 109:23 110:25 111:6

member 44:12 45:2 46:20 49:7 50:19 66:22 91:13 108:21,22 109:9, 13,14,18,25 110:5,8, 14,17

members 49:4,11 51:3,25 84:20

memory 54:14

mention 20:12 74:2 77:23

mentioned 33:22 53:13 108:23 145:11

met 133:23

metabolic 89:2 93:7

metabolism 23:22

metabolite 24:3,8,9, 13,14

methamphetamine 79:2

microscope 14:17 microscopic 10:6 15:1 33:25 42:1 144:15

microscopically 34:9 144:5,13

midline 141:13

mike 135:23

mild 63:19,24 64:6

Miller 148:21 152:20

million 68:23

mind 19:2 47:12 54:13, 16,18 70:15 74:16 140:6

mine 125:25

minute 21:15 38:10 97:14 98:11 126:14 148:11

minutes 7:24 27:19 62:11 77:6 81:12,20

92:6

**Mississippi** 17:1 19:23 20:3,16 24:25 25:3,19 26:14 27:3,17 32:4 33:4 35:7 61:13, 15,20 73:5 124:22,24 128:1

Missouri 57:17 mistake 8:25 9:1,2 mistakes 30:8 moderate 93:6 modification 105:19 modus 18:23 money 49:8.10 131:7

monies 130:14 monitoring 126:18

monoxide 82:2 month 54:14 107:4

117:23 **months** 18:6,13 19:6

moorings 32:15 morning 136:23

motion 94:11

mouth 76:10 139:3 147:15

move 150:1

mucosa 34:12

mucosal 34:11

multi-organ 144:16

multiple 96:4,15,21

musculature 32:19,20

myocardial 92:21

Ν

N-I-C-H-O-L-S 55:6

naked 14:14

named 49:11 112:25 113:3,8,14 names 54:25

nanograms 24:5

narcotic 65:6

narrative 17:12

**National** 26:23 45:20, 22 46:2 66:18

**nature** 15:7,15 33:25 43:23 49:21 50:11 52:3 65:25 74:6 76:13 94:6 115:22 122:25

necessarily 80:17 84:21 139:8

neck 80:22

needed 47:25 52:10 53:3,6

negated 94:1

nerves 145:7

**nervous** 68:1 79:1 145:6

neuropathology 53:9

ng/ml 62:15,17

Nichols 55:5 125:8

Nichols' 55:9,13

night 100:11

**NMS** 27:15 28:2 36:3 134:23 135:4,6,7

nominally 103:13

non-pmr 98:8

non-prone 98:8

**normal** 71:20 76:8,14 77:4 142:4

Nos 152:24

nose 76:11 139:3

notation 136:4

**note** 42:8,25 43:9,13 134:13 136:12

noted 74:23 77:14

notes 28:5

notice 117:11 123:3,10

noticed 74:19

**November** 17:15 18:3, 8,10 29:24 107:2

nowadays 86:25

number 8:14 16:12,20 29:19 54:2,10,15 68:22 78:22,23 96:18 118:13, 14,16,19 119:16 126:23 129:8

numbers 54:9,17,18 55:3,6 56:10,16 77:7 118:21,24

nurses 150:13

0

Oakland 7:25

obese 141:2,16,18

Object 18:14 72:18

objection 102:15 122:24

**objections** 122:20,22

objective 71:3

observation 14:11

observations 73:10 93:4 127:12

observe 73:13

observing 72:15

obstructing 139:6

obstruction 142:21

obtained 36:22

occasion 59:14 111:25

occasionally 47:6

occasions 65:19

**occupies** 141:13

occur 69:15 138:12,19 139:10

occurred 90:8,21 98:8 127:7

occurring 62:19 93:10

ocular 34:13,17

offering 73:16

offhand 58:4 68:2

**office** 28:14 43:4,19 107:21 128:3 129:7 134:10

officer 150:23

Officer-involved 140:1.9

officers 84:4 150:20

officers' 136:12

offices 28:15,16

official 46:1

oldest 99:22

**one's** 141:21 142:6 143:3

Onecare 43:12

open 107:7,10 108:5

operandi 18:23

**opinion** 18:6 48:17 50:1,2 56:3 70:22 78:6 83:6 96:23 97:1 122:7 124:9 125:25 126:1 128:7 137:6,18 149:10

opinions 18:13 38:17 47:23 49:18 52:24 53:19 54:21 55:10,11 56:9 59:1 73:17 84:24 103:5 122:17 124:6 125:17,20 126:16 127:9 132:1 150:8,12, 14,20,24

opposed 23:15

opposite 75:5

oral 143:19

order 116:15

ordered 152:23

Oldered 102.2

orders 102:4

ordinarily 145:15

ordinary 101:20

organ 23:24 53:10 143:14 organization 48:5 60:13,16,17 66:19,22 91:10,13 109:15 110:3, 16,17

**organizations** 85:16 110:9,19

organs 10:3 14:11 15:12 23:19 31:12,13, 15,21 32:7,9,21,24 33:3

original 14:3 19:10 26:24 31:22 43:10 101:1 115:3 152:15,21

output 95:4 99:9

overwhelming 84:1 119:13

owing 151:14

**oxygen** 71:16,22 72:8 74:21 75:10 76:2,3,5,8 81:11,12 82:4 94:12 137:24,25 138:6 142:17,22

oxygenation 96:5,17 138:3

Р

P-A-R-I-K-H 125:14

P-A-R-I-M 125:14

**p.m.** 9:5

pacing 63:12

pages 29:19 82:13

**paid** 103:12 114:12 116:4,6

**pain** 75:13 144:24 145:4,7 147:12

palpation 35:4

pancreas 33:2

panic 62:7 75:9

panoply 51:11

paper 45:17 133:7 135:25

\_\_\_\_

**papers** 55:7 103:1

paragraph 41:1 82:19 89:5 95:19 97:12,17 98:5 99:2

paragraphs 27:10 36:18 38:22

parameters 83:10

paranoid 62:8

paravertebral 32:20

parent 112:18

Parikh 125:14.15

Parikh's 126:3

Parim 125:13

parking 103:15

part 8:11 12:23 19:19 25:23 29:25 35:15 65:15,16 66:7 73:11 83:7.8 112:16 139:16

partial 80:17 82:1

party 109:4

pass 82:16 148:23

passed 21:11

past 65:21 141:13

pathological 14:1 42:4 93:20

pathologist 43:11 55:14 73:4 103:8 106:3,17,20 116:22,25 117:3,5,7

pathologists 48:21 67:14 86:4,19,20,25 87:9 106:4

**pathology** 9:17 15:23 45:19 46:18 47:18 48:25 49:23 52:12,13, 18 53:12 58:19 59:6 60:2 67:2,15 82:10 87:5,12 95:8,15 100:18 104:2,4,11,14,16 112:6,8,14,15 113:7 130:15

patient 72:15 76:18 81:4.8

patient's 48:22

patiently 133:11

patients 73:20,23,25 112:3,9,10

pattern 89:12 96:1

**pay** 46:4 49:9 50:4,9 107:7 115:18 116:11

**payment** 103:16,18 114:16 115:3,4,15,17, 19,20 116:2,16

payroll 103:11

pearl 81:17

peer 87:12

peer-reviewed 48:8, 25 49:1 51:15,23 58:1, 2,5,8,13 84:12,16,18 86:1 87:5 95:11,12 104:22

pending 14:8

Pennsylvania 103:10 109:25

**people** 35:17 47:21,23 49:5,17 50:9 51:6 52:4, 7,13 54:25 58:23,24 66:13 67:1,6,9,13,20, 25 68:14,22 69:18 78:25 79:11 80:22 81:14,15,17 84:8,22 85:12,15 88:13 92:24 94:1,19 99:19 103:5 107:24 108:24 145:1, 18 147:19 149:14

people's 58:25

percent 49:12 68:20 71:17,19 72:9 74:21 78:24 120:10,16

**percentage** 80:19 120:5 121:4,15 130:19, 25 131:2,8,9,13,15

percentages 131:4

performed 9:3 14:4 18:12 31:10

period 64:17 84:6 146:11

permitted 13:25 122:8

person 72:20 81:19 93:19 97:8 99:22 103:7 134:17 135:11 137:18, 23 141:2 142:15 145:6 147:8

person's 80:2

personal 37:17

personally 113:15 116:23

personnel 73:2,3 74:11

**perspective** 50:13 139:15

pertaining 28:5 29:17 57:2

pertains 110:21

perusal 30:23

petechial 34:13,21,24

Ph.d. 55:6

pharmacological 62:18 79:18

pharmacologically 63:19

pharmacology 104:17

pharyngeal 143:12,19

**phenomenon** 75:8 86:8 147:4

Phillips 7:8 11:5,9
12:17,24 13:8 18:15
22:4,8 29:11,15 31:7
32:5 40:12,14,16,20
61:3,5,11,16,18 73:15
84:11 88:15,19 94:24
100:12,16 102:6,10,17
114:2,6,19,23 123:2,9
124:16,20 126:22
127:8,18,22 128:25
129:4,10,14 130:1,5
132:9,13 133:10,25
135:5 144:9,18 146:5
151:11,16 152:14

**phone** 10:14 36:23 136:16

**photo** 127:25

photographs 28:7,12

**photos** 25:11 28:16, 17,20,21,22 128:2,4,6

phrase 149:9,11

**physical** 9:25 64:16,20 65:2 66:10 76:15 89:2 137:17 141:20 143:1 145:17

physician 42:10,16,17 112:4 124:4,14

**physicians** 87:7,10 95:10 148:22

physics 49:24

physiologic 85:4

physiological 62:5 75:8 76:14

picture 38:16 142:2

piece 55:25

**pieces** 14:18

Pittsburgh 104:3,5,7 107:24 108:13 118:8

**place** 84:4 85:18 89:9 102:4 126:19 127:14 142:18

places 105:25

placing 101:2

plaintiff 120:3,10,12, 16,20,23 121:11 151:24

plaintiff's 109:16 110:4 131:25

play 52:23 108:16 120:17

played 25:25 70:23

plays 52:19

plead 108:20

pled 111:12

pleural 34:24

PMR 95:24 97:20 99:10

**PMR-O** 95:21

PMRP 89:8,11,17 90:9,

21 91:20 93:5

**point** 17:6 20:20 21:23 33:12 61:4 71:10 82:25 97:2 104:21 107:16 123:25 135:23 136:15 140:19

pointing 73:9

poison 94:8

pole 150:4

**police** 11:19 28:18 38:7 39:10 43:8 67:10 74:8,9,10 77:23 84:2,4, 10 90:3 98:15 100:5 102:2,3 127:14 136:14, 19 140:12 146:21

**police-related** 57:7,15 79:9 145:2

policeman 79:12

policemen 139:11

policies 105:9

political 48:12

politically 108:2

politics 48:13

**portion** 77:7,15 120:2, 3 123:7 131:17

portions 140:25

portray 38:16

pose 70:5

position 44:21 64:16, 25 71:1 72:22,24 74:9 77:5 80:16 82:15,24 83:2,19,20 84:5,6 85:6, 8 86:3,12,21 87:1 89:18,20 90:22 92:15 94:2 95:3,21,24,25 96:3,16 97:10 98:16 99:4 100:4 101:3 102:5 103:25 104:23 105:13 106:9,12,14,16,21 111:20,23 137:12,13, 15,16,23 139:1

positional 56:18 57:2 58:3,10 70:22 78:5 80:12 81:3,4 82:15 85:7 95:23 102:21

137:7,8,10,20,22 138:10 139:9,15 141:4, 21 142:7 143:3

positioning 93:5 138:12,20

positions 44:17 98:9 99:10 103:1,6 104:8 106:7

positive 20:9 24:3,22

possession 18:6,13

possibly 10:17

posteriorly 149:16

postmortem 8:13,24

postpartum 35:5

postulated 95:20

potential 136:25

potentiate 63:16

potpourri 51:11

**pounds** 97:21 99:11, 23

**practice** 20:19 26:5 73:19 108:17 112:17 115:7

practiced 109:1

Practicing 108:22

preceding 37:21

precipitating 79:17

predicate 105:6

predominantly 110:4

preexisting 141:20 142:6

preface 78:18

prefer 78:9 151:22

preferable 33:7

preference 23:24

preference 20.24

preliminary 29:12 30:13,16

preparation 14:19

preparatory 122:25

prepare 12:8

**prepared** 13:10 15:3 17:1,17 36:10 50:3 70:9

preparing 14:16 53:23

prepayment 115:7

present 35:12 46:19 106:19 120:11,21 146:1

presented 103:2

**press** 18:3

pressing 80:22 139:10,11

pressure 71:14,15 141:8

pretty 19:1,3 38:8 110:10 116:2 117:24

**Prevention** 139:25 140:9

previous 10:3

previously 12:11 95:20 127:24 134:15 135:25

**primarily** 62:6 64:18, 24 65:3,9 150:25

**primary** 42:10,16 60:3 124:4,13

**prior** 10:20 65:19 91:17 92:3,6,13 126:19 133:23 144:8

private 7:18 28:20 35:23 36:9 103:19

privileged 30:16

privileges 112:2

pro 108:19

problem 100:1,7 143:11,21

**problems** 11:16 77:20 102:22 105:13

proceed 62:12

proceedings 57:13

process 19:20 77:4

processes 93:20

**produce** 62:4 64:4 68:16 101:4,18 143:21

produced 68:12

produces 64:8

producing 34:6 66:8 142:21

product 30:6,14 132:21

professional 44:16 45:3,25 48:4,11 60:17 72:15,20 110:12

professionals 73:11

professor 104:2,4,6,
11,14

professors 103:14

programs 111:3

prohibited 122:6

**prolonged** 64:17 77:5 87:1

promulgated 105:20

**prone** 80:13,15 89:18 92:14 93:5 95:3,25 96:16 98:16 99:4,10 105:12 137:13

proof 101:19

**properly** 75:22 88:7 139:14

proponents 145:18

proposed 67:24

prospective 98:14,21

prostate 33:2

**provide** 46:22,24 152:17

provided 8:11 12:4,11

18:3 21:9 39:23 41:4 43:3,18 56:22 116:19 123:22 131:24 134:6

providing 10:5

psychodelic 62:4,16

**psychological** 85:4 97:6 143:15

psychotic 65:6,9

**public** 30:3 88:12 104:6 116:14

**publication** 44:22 45:20,22,25 46:1,8 50:17,22,24 57:10,11 58:12 87:14 88:9 95:7, 14 139:24

**publications** 44:16 45:6 48:11 57:25 58:2 102:21

**published** 55:7 57:1, 13 58:6 59:12 84:15 85:24 87:4,11 88:1 95:1 99:16 104:22 139:22 140:4

**publishes** 60:14,17 91:10

**pulmonary** 33:19 72:5 96:1 101:5,19

pulmonary/chest 72:6

pupils 147:16

purchased 135:11

purchases 134:16

purpose 44:3 71:4

**purposes** 19:16 134:20

pursuant 148:4

**pushed** 141:7

**put** 17:17 99:23 100:9 110:20 129:7 135:20

putting 49:19 72:16

Q

quantitative 56:9,15

quantities 54:3,11

**question** 20:1 35:15 47:20 55:23 57:23 63:23 66:6,15 67:18 69:12 70:10,14,15,16 71:3,4 73:1 74:15 75:4 77:18 86:19 87:18 90:4 96:13 104:20 120:25

123:6 128:16 133:11 134:1,3 135:13 137:4 143:17

questioning 133:24

**questions** 70:2,4,5 133:13,14 134:7 144:9 148:9,23,25 149:2 151:6,10

quibble 69:4

quickly 94:15

quote 136:17

quoting 101:14 134:14

#### R

raised 70:8,10 71:16

rapidly 138:7

rare 50:11 62:12,19

rate 71:13,16 72:8

ratio 131:12

reach 13:18 15:19,23 17:7 29:23 65:24 82:4

reached 17:20,23 30:1 83:6 102:13 105:22

reaction 65:15

reactions 62:8.9

read 13:17 47:4 50:25 51:1 53:21 54:24 61:25 62:21 64:7 77:16 78:14 82:22 85:2 87:21 90:18 91:21 92:17 93:12,13 96:6 98:10,18 99:6,13 101:9,23 105:10,15,16 123:6,7 135:2 136:4 138:9,17 152:5,7

reading 77:17 147:10

ready 9:25

reality 19:17

realm 48:12 53:11

reason 30:10 33:11 81:11

reasonable 48:21 78:6 86:3 reasons 26:8 66:16 79:14

recall 10:12,14 11:12 12:6 26:12 32:18 37:9 46:5,25 47:8,15 56:25 57:3 59:8 71:13 72:4 76:20 109:22 110:16 113:2 121:19,20 134:21,24

receive 26:11 38:15 47:5 50:4,9 51:1 60:22, 24 61:2 103:17,19 134:18 136:3.18

received 17:3,5 19:8 20:5,10,11,19 22:9,15 25:8,12,16 26:13 27:16,22 28:2 32:6 36:24 37:5,13 39:9,10 40:6 42:5,12,13,22,24 43:12,15,16 49:8 55:3 124:5 126:9 127:1 128:1

recent 89:7,10,24 98:14

recess 61:9 133:16,17 148:19

recision 105:18

recognizable 102:2

recognize 10:22 29:2 67:16 86:9 87:6 100:19 144:21

recognized 55:4 71:5 85:25

recollect 121:12

recollection 11:13 13:11 18:22,24 37:12, 14 38:11 47:2 53:24 132:24 135:20

record 39:10 42:18,19 43:12,14 54:7 61:10 71:11 73:6,12 74:22 76:17 107:6 123:18 133:18 148:10,16,20

recordation 146:23

records 8:5 12:4,6 29:11 39:15 42:6,9,14, 15,22 43:1,5,17,18 44:2 74:4 123:24 124:3,5,11,13 130:6

Reexamination 82:14

refer 13:4 20:7 26:4 27:20 40:8 47:6,14 54:2 56:8 59:13 78:13 81:6 87:3

reference 16:3 19:22 20:13,15,19,23 25:15, 18,20,22 26:6,8 39:7 40:8,21 45:10 47:8,19 52:11 53:3,6 56:19 57:18 58:18 60:20 61:20,23 62:23 63:10 64:11 71:7 74:13,22 76:18,20 90:10 91:7 92:4 98:24 100:17

referenced 16:1 96:22 136:3,14 149:8

references 8:24 43:25 55:7 63:20 68:5

referencing 54:22 136:13

referred 24:18 28:2 30:10,14 37:9 38:6 39:11 47:15 54:11 55:3 56:16 63:5 68:14 72:9 105:20 111:22 115:21 125:7 135:1 150:16

referring 19:10 27:15 30:11 43:7 55:8 56:14 89:23 96:10

refers 15:11 137:22

refine 96:13

reflected 73:5 74:20 77:15 110:7

reflection 71:23

reflects 109:9

regard 9:21 12:19 24:1 54:21 58:25 120:14

regularly 46:21,22,24 47:4 50:25 60:25

reject 88:3

rejected 67:1,8 83:23

relate 53:10 104:9

124:9

related 64:14,23 66:14 67:20,25 68:3,8 80:3 123:13,15 131:10

relates 19:17 70:7 135:8

relative 56:16 115:5

relevance 66:2 128:8

relevant 15:15 25:24 26:2 28:17,21,22 101:7,18

reliability 58:22

reliable 23:20 47:18,21 51:20

**rely** 43:2,17 47:7 52:4 53:18 55:9,13,16

relying 53:21

remain 90:22

remained 23:6

remaining 129:16

remember 54:15 57:17 59:22 60:13 68:4 69:22 109:21 117:13 121:6,8,22 122:21 132:7

remove 34:16 72:23

removed 32:7,13,17, 21,24 33:3 107:19

removing 76:8

reopening 31:14

repeat 85:15

repeatedly 76:1

repeating 55:23

repetitive 133:25

rephrase 122:10 134:3

report 8:2,19,25 12:8, 14 13:10,14,18,23 14:3,24 15:10 16:2 17:1,5,9,11,12,13,17, 19 19:1,11,22,23,25 20:3,6,7,13,16,23 21:21,25 22:13 24:1, 10,23,25 25:2,8,13,15,

19,23 26:3,13,14,18, 23,24 27:3,4,7,15,18 28:2,3 29:3,16,18 30:11,13,15,16,18 33:22 36:10,12 38:7,18 39:3,10 40:8,21 41:9, 14,19 43:10 44:6 47:16 53:14,24 54:1,3,5 55:4, 9,13,14,16,19,24 56:17 61:12,14,17,20 62:23 63:8,10 64:11,21 70:1, 9 74:2,10,14,17 113:16,18 124:22 125:12,15 126:3 129:6, 9 130:16 133:1 135:7 144:6 148:4 149:8

reported 27:12 35:8 62:17 65:14 68:25 69:21 77:22 79:25 80:8 89:7,10

reporter 123:8 151:20, 22 152:5,19

reporting 28:23

reports 19:3 21:14 29:12 31:3 38:13 43:7 68:19 69:8,9 94:1 98:7 115:23 124:24 125:1.7

represent 149:6

represented 87:22 109:4

representing 126.8

Republicans 107:17

request 116:1,16 120:2,3 121:17 134:18 136:2

requested 21:22 123:7 125:1 147:25

require 115:7,11,19,20 116:8

research 45:7 58:9 86:1,5 99:16 100:25 102:20,25 103:4 105:14

resected 31:12

reserve 152:10

reservoir 81:12

residency 112:12

resign 107:5 111:23

resigned 107:3,14

respected 48:3,4,9 51:13,15,16 59:24 117:3,4,7

respective 32:15

respiration 74:21

respiratory 71:13,16, 19,23 72:8,10 76:14 77:12 82:24 83:20 85:6 86:14 137:19 138:5,14, 21 143:18

respond 70:6

respondeat 113:12

response 78:19 79:16 122:21

responsibility 44:23 45:5

responsible 83:1

rest 19:17,18 151:19

restrain 86:13

restrained 11:23 12:1 80:13 90:14,16

restraint 80:14,15 82:15,23 83:19 85:8 89:3,18 92:15 93:11 95:3 96:16 105:12 138:12,19 149:10,11

restraints 85:3

restrict 93:7

restrictive 89:12 96:1 101:4

result 62:19 63:8 69:15 76:25 77:1,3,4 79:7 97:9 137:18

resulted 89:11

results 14:8 22:10 23:7 92:8 95:25 97:21 101:6

resuscitated 35:18

resuscitation 35:10

retain 116:8 132:18

retained 13:14 119:2 125:13

retired 140:12

retraction 105:18

retrieved 21:3

retrieving 23:14

review 12:4 43:1,17 44:7,24 45:8,10,12,17 46:22 47:1,3 51:25 56:23 60:25 88:5,8 124:21

reviewed 17:24 19:23 20:2,20 41:7 42:6 43:20 44:1 49:17 51:24 52:22 87:13 123:19 124:2 125:4 126:6 127:23 128:4,11

reviewer 87:21 88:4

reviewers 87:13

reviewing 53:1 112:9

reviews 130:13

revised 45:1 139:23

**rib** 35:2,6,8,11,13,15

right-hand 90:13,19 91:17 95:19

rigid 20:21

ripped 107:20

rise 134:11

risk 95:22 97:23 141:3, 21 142:6 143:3

road 40:23 107:25 108:1

rod 150:4

**role** 10:5 25:25 52:19, 23 55:17 70:23

**room** 64:12 74:8 87:7,9 95:9 97:4 99:22 108:10 123:16 133:13

rose 71:14,15

rough 69:8 118:24

roughly 119:9 120:8,9 130:23 131:3,14,15

routinely 28:16

Royal 67:10

rule 20:22 122:13,16

rules 29:13

ruling 122:25

S

safe 110:9

samples 21:3

San 84:10

sarcastic 72:25

saturation 74:21

says' 90:24

scenario 38:7 44:5 137:17 146:20 150:21

scene 41:2,5 136:19

**schedule** 62:2 113:20, 24 114:24

scheduled 147:23

scholarliness 88:6

**school** 103:14 104:1,3, 5,6,13

schools 104:12

**science** 45:4 48:13,15 49:24 57:9 59:2 91:11

sciences 50:16,18 51:4,8 104:17

scientific 48:11 51:5, 6,10,12 66:5 78:7 102:19 136:24

scientifically 45:14 69:1 78:20

Scientists 88:21 91:8

scope 150:24

scream 75:24 76:2,3

screaming 64:22 74:24 75:21 79:24

seated 89:12 secondary 99:4 137:6,

**secret** 70:11

secretary's 9:2

section 7:25 36:11 44:15 56:18 84:25

sectioned 144:12

sections 51:9

seepage 23:6,8

seizures 62:7

self-imposed 20:22

seminars 110:20 111:2

**send** 44:25 52:15 116:12,14

sense 19:4 126:1,17

sensory 145:7

**sentence** 27:11 41:18 82:18,22 85:2 89:5 90:8,14,18,24 92:25 93:2 98:5,6,13 99:1

sentences 96:22

separate 32:9,11 47:11 129:21

separately 40:17 42:19 46:4

**September** 25:4,5 29:7 30:2,12,20 31:4 37:19 40:25 82:13 132:6,15

series 44:19 49:16

**served** 50:21 82:10 88:22 91:15

services 26:23 131:20

**Serving** 130:12

set 49:18 69:11 94:11 110:8 127:12 139:19 152:15

**sets** 96:11 125:24 140:23

setting 90:2,3 93:11

seventh 35:19

severe 34:5 141:25

shackle 149:24

shackles 140:15

shaft 140:21 150:4

shipped 10:21

**short** 61:9 133:17 148:19

**shortly** 17:8 23:15

**show** 15:12 24:17 68:19 88:20 92:13 94:25 114:11 130:6

showed 33:23 92:5

**showing** 13:13 17:4 92:4 114:8 132:7

**shown** 69:1 96:19 102:21 108:6

shows 47:24 89:24

side 90:13 141:14

sign 116:9 147:5 152:7

signature 152:10

signed 11:2 52:22

significance 26:25 43:23

significant 30:19 38:12 91:19 92:13 102:12 142:9,23 145:10

**significantly** 48:1 99:9 132:4

**signs** 147:6,8,20

similar 98:7 135:13

simply 49:22 149:24

single 107:16

sir 7:9 8:23 10:22 20:2 21:3,22 32:1 34:18 35:9 38:1,22 39:19 41:16 50:2 60:7 74:19 96:12 107:13 108:1 120:6 125:11 138:18 140:3,8 141:12 145:9

147:10 148:8 150:24

sit 99:25 105:2

situ 31:15,21

**situation** 65:2 75:16, 19,21 92:1 97:4 100:5

situations 82:7

size 141:6

**slides** 14:16,20,22 15:4,11,23 41:19,20

**small** 89:11 96:1 103:13

smoked 134:14,15,19

smoker 134:16

smothered 81:21

**so-called** 90:11 95:23 139:4

soft 32:15,20 35:21

sole 106:19

something's 98:3

sound 45:14

sounds 61:1

**source** 23:22 37:21 41:1 74:9 86:22

**sources** 38:8 47:10,19 51:18 52:10

Southaven 43:8 149:7

Southeastern 148:22

southwestern 103:10

**space** 145:4

Spacing 30:25

**speak** 12:12 18:18 52:5 66:14 86:6,18 87:25 110:24 111:1 125:22

speaking 87:7

**speaks** 73:12

specialties 51:7

specialty 51:12

**specific** 15:5,13,15 18:24,25 25:9,20 33:24 38:9,10 47:8,14 53:10, 15,18,24 54:2,8,10,11 55:6,7,24 56:3,7,8,14, 15 71:23 72:4 81:6,7 85:17 102:24 132:24 150:22 151:6

**specifically** 11:12 13:16 27:1 43:11 47:16 59:22 61:19 84:3

specimen 23:13,14 113:16

specimens 22:20 112:9

spinal 32:21

spleen 33:2

spoken 38:1 111:5

St 112:19

**stages** 115:10

stain 15:11 41:19

stand 66:17

standard 9:6 73:17

stapled 40:17

start 66:4 89:9

**started** 9:9 46:1 61:6 90:18 118:7

starting 117:21

startlingly 132:3

**state** 13:19,21 27:11 28:18 32:3 54:6 64:21 65:5,16 66:10 70:16 74:7 77:25 84:2 86:2 97:6 105:8

**stated** 24:9 26:8 30:22 65:10 73:13 137:5 139:14 147:2

**statement** 15:10 18:3, 9,10,16 27:14 30:3 38:19 39:3 40:4 53:25 65:13 72:4,10 76:4 83:3,5,14,18 85:9,14 89:15 91:23 96:8,9,11, 17 126:7 127:1 135:1

**statements** 37:22 45:13 51:16 67:9 83:25

105:4 **States** 84:3 status 148:6 stenographer 99:24 Stephen 152:20 stethoscope 72:12,16 Steve 148:21 stimulant 79:1 **stimulants** 66:15 68:2 stomach 141:6,7,11 **stop** 13:3 **stopped** 106:24 stopping 61:4 stops 76:25 strapped 80:10 straps 77:8 streets 107:23 strength 145:10,17 147:12 strenuous 101:3 stress 85:4 strict 149:14 strings 10:2 **strip** 77:15 **strips** 77:16 strong 67:8 struggle 90:16 101:4 146:13 struggling 146:10 strychnine 94:8 studies 20:24 21:6 91:18 92:3,7,13 95:23 96:2,4,10,15,21 100:8 study 64:2 83:22 84:9, 12 89:7,10,24 91:25 92:6,9,12 98:15,21 100:8 stuff 14:5 21:1 108:11

stuffs 139:2 subclavian 62:1 subjective 24:10 48:14 59:4 subjects 91:18,19 92:14 93:5 **submission** 115:4,12, **submit** 14:5,18 17:10 23:10 45:11 submitted 8:2 10:1 17:9,12 19:25 21:1,4 22:3,24,25 23:2 25:10 29:3 30:7 32:22 37:9 38:20 39:1,4,11 40:9 55:4 58:1,5,12 95:9 116:7 126:2,4 134:22 subscribe 49:11 subsequent 101:16 105:14 137:19 subsequently 12:2 118:4 subspecialties 51:7 substance 62:2 substantial 115:22 substantive 26:2,25 substitute 13:5 sudden 83:1,9 90:6,8, 12,14,20 94:6,7 98:8, 17 145:20 suddenness 83:13 sued 113:5 suffering 63:4 **sufficient** 38:16.17 88:6 97:22 sufficiently 88:7 suggest 70:4 suggesting 92:2 suggestions 45:2 suggests 20:8,9 85:5 suicide 62:20 69:19

suit 112:21 summaries 38:13 39:22 43:3,18 123:21 134.6 **summary** 36:19 38:3, 19,25 39:4,16,17,19 40:9 41:12,20 97:17,19 134:8 sums 15:14 Sun 29:11 superficial 52:2 superior 113:13 Superman 145:3 supervised 52:22 **supine** 99:10 supplemental 114:25 115:22 supply 82:4 support 92:9 97:20 supportive 127:16 supports 104:22 supraventricular 68:12 77:13 surprise 139:20 surrounding 103:9 survey 86:23 102:19 Susan 100:9 susceptible 141:24 142:16,25 sustained 122:22 **Suzanna** 100:21 sweat 146:12 **sweating** 146:2,8 147:13 sworn 7:4 sympathomimetic 62:6 Symposium 57:8 symptom 145:9,11 146:16

symptoms 79:21 144:19,22 147:7,9,11, 17,21 synergistic 63:21 synonymous 30:15 synonymously 30:17 149:12 system 68:1 79:1 107:1 143:19 144:16 145:6 systems 53:11 106:6 143:14 Т table 85:23 tachycardia 68:12 77:14 takes 22:16 94:15 taking 10:2 76:8 77:16 83:14 127:14 talk 16:22 75:18 81:19 90:6 107:8,9,11,12 108:12,15,16 118:12 talked 18:19 37:2,3,4 70:24 82:9 83:15 132:2.6 143:10 150:11 151.7 talking 36:12 81:12 82:17 92:20 149:20 talks 57:14 136:12 tangential 74:6 telling 20:18 66:4 67:4, 21,22 91:25 tells 116:10 temperature 146:14 temporal 83:10 90:11 ten 7:24 110:9 120:19. 23 121:10 tend 118:1 tendency 142:18 term 140:14 149:23

**terms** 15:6 30:17 34:5 70:20 127:13 131:3

terrible 75:21

territory 108:9

test 23:21,25 24:3 72:12 101:6

tested 135:2 136:5,8

testes 32:17

testified 7:5 116:5 119:7,17,23 121:7

**testify** 118:4 119:9 121:3,9,14 122:8,13,17 148:3.5

testifying 56:5,12 119:15

**testimony** 59:20 112:16 119:11 121:2 123:7 131:6 136:23 144:9

testing 21:2 58:9 96:2 101:17 102:20 105:14 134:19.23

tests 14:4 23:1

Tetrahydrocannabin ol 24:5

text 60:3 139:21,25

**textbook** 53:2 56:4 57:20 58:17,22 100:22

**textbooks** 50:15 51:19 52:12

Thanksgiving 17:14

THC 24:5,9,12,13

theoretically 63:25

theory 105:15 144:19

thereof 143:7

thereto 71:4

thing 26:10 29:5 31:1 74:19 94:6,9 99:21 148:11

things 9:25 10:4 17:10 19:2,5,15 26:11 32:16 33:24 39:11 40:5,17 43:25 44:4,14 47:11 48:12,13,17 50:11,14 52:2,16,17 53:8,21 65:8 72:21 74:3 79:25 93:17 108:23,24 115:25 122:9 123:11 129:15 132:3 143:15 145:15 147:6,7

thinking 19:12 25:10 44:15

thoracic 31:13

thorax 35:4 101:17

**thought** 17:25 50:5 59:8 70:13 76:10 87:13 108:5 117:1 121:1.13

thoughts 17:22 66:9 70:19 78:3

thousand 118:23

throat 139:4

throw 118:23

**tied** 137:14 140:20 150:4

Tim 38:20 39:5 121:17

time 9:3,6,7,15 11:24
12:3,7 14:10 16:13,20
17:4,6,18,25 20:2
22:21 26:7,16 27:25
28:13 37:8,12,13 38:6
39:9 42:20 47:15,22
48:10 54:15 64:17
69:22 70:25 74:16 76:9
82:3 84:6 90:4 104:25
105:11 106:19 109:1,
12 110:7,18 112:7
113:2,4 114:13 115:12
120:11,21 121:6 133:1,
15 138:17 146:11,12

timeline 129:19,24

timelines 129:20,25 134:5

times 30:22 35:17 57:4 68:21 77:14 105:21 111:8 115:12 117:18 118:6,16,22 119:1,7,9, 12,17,23 121:10,11 135:14 150:16

tissue 14:18 22:3,24, 25 32:15 33:19,23 35:21 143:13

tissues 23:19,21 32:20

title 82:14 95:2

titles 111:6

today 12:11 21:10 30:23 33:23 56:5,12 74:15 96:20 102:25 105:2,21 114:7,13 123:11,16 125:7 126:11 150:16

today's 114:16

told 11:13,16 19:11 20:5 29:22 35:14 38:1 41:23 51:22 61:5 64:6 69:11 77:22 122:14 132:2,14 137:3 151:12

**top** 10:25 30:6 37:20 39:18 41:10 70:3

topic 58:3 91:3

**total** 80:16 81:11,20 118:15 119:17,19

touching 140:17

town 7:25

tox 61:20 124:24 125:1

toxic 24:21

toxicity 56:16

toxicological 26:22

toxicologist 21:2

toxicology 14:4,6,8 20:24 21:1,6,14,18 22:10 23:13,24 24:2,25 25:2,15,19,22 26:14 27:3,17 36:2,8 61:12, 14 104:18

trachea 143:9

traditionally 106:1

train 81:17

**trained** 9:17 72:14,20 73:2,3

training 9:16 118:9

transcript 152:3,6

transmittal 42:14

transmitted 37:10

transpired 19:10 38:14

transportation 36:4,8

trauma 62:20

treat 112:3

treating 112:4

tree 34:9

Trey 7:18,20

triage 74:20

trial 109:10,20,25 110:21 119:7,17,18 120:25 121:2 147:23,

trials 130:13

trip 63:6

24.25

trouble 72:2

**Troy** 7:20 27:12 29:17 35:24 62:24 63:2 74:7, 11 89:20 134:14,16,19 135:11,15,18,24

Troy's 42:9

**true** 38:4 75:5 87:14,16 105:17

**trustworthy** 49:13,15, 16

truth 108:7

Tuesday 134:9

tumor 34:1

turned 107:19

type 149:24

types 99:3

typical 28:12

U

**U.S.** 62:2 69:23 107:20 108:12

ultimately 16:25 124:21 138:7,24

unable 72:13 76:11 valid 23:8 45:7 87:13 volunteers 97:3 workers' 117:24 unassailable 49:20 validity 87:22 working 81:23 W uncomfortable 64:16 validly 87:24 works 138:1.7 uncommon 62:9 valves 143:9 world 19:18 waffling 48:2 uncontrollably 64:22 valvular 141:25 worsens 94:14 wait 21:15 40:2 42:7 97:14 98:11 underlying 143:23 variations 59:3 worthy 87:14 88:9 144:1 waiting 133:11 varied 120:7 wrist 80:17,18 understand 15:17 walk 107:23 varies 28:14 53:4 82:6 wrists 137:13 140:20 37:1 39:14 69:20 75:4 85:21 149:13,16,22,25 walked 104:19 77:17,22 98:3 120:1 122:12 131:1 134:1 vary 45:17 81:10,15 write 28:23 140:2 walking 71:21 136:22 140:13.15 146:14 writing 19:1 37:6 49:20 wanted 11:21 144:21 146:25 147:2 vascular 92:22 68:14 108:25 water 81:16 understanding vehicle 77:9 written 19:1 30:18 55:1 127:16 135:22 140:19, ways 139:18 57:20,21 59:12 67:7 24 144:8,14 ventilate 75:3 111.7 Wecht 7:3,10,11 15:17 understood 55:22 ventilatory 89:1,12 22:11 41:23 108:21 wrong 98:3 113:10,14 112:16 93:7,9 95:22 130:15 133:10.22 wrote 19:21 37:20 135:17 136:11 139:20 undertook 102:18 verbalize 76:6 140:11 152:1 undocumented 52:3 version 152:18 Wecht's 8:13 United 84:3 vial 135:24,25 136:3,7 Х week 18:25 54:13 universities 8:1 victim 100:5 145:2 weeks 19:5 81:23 Xtasy 68:6 79:2 university 7:23 57:9 victim's 80:22 weigh 99:25 103:14 104:3,5,7,10, video 28:10 41:2,4,8 13,14,16 116:25 Υ weight 80:6 93:6 95:4 videos 28:11 97:21 99:5,11,24 unprecipitated year 16:9,14,17 33:14. 100:10 122:24 videotape 40:22 17 50:15 112:12,17,20 weights 101:17 141:17 untrustworthy 50:5,6 videotapes 28:9 118:2,5,10 119:5,10,12 126:3,5 135:24 whatsoever 105:19 **Upchurch** 40:14 61:3, views 48:6 7 126:11,15,20 133:16, years 9:20 47:24 50:23 widely 49:3 51:2 Vilke 117:8 21,22 148:8,25 152:11, 52:18,20 85:18 108:14 wife 11:15 23 Vincent 59:6,7 100:17 109:13,14 110:10,16, 23 112:13 117:22 upper 140:25 wind 81:13 119:14 violent 146:16 147:13 118.6, 11, 14, 24 119.19, wishes 122:18 upwards 141:7 20 120:19 130:8 vis-a-vis 55:17 urine 23:17 witnesses 110:22 yell 75:24 76:2,3 visit 42:23 user 62:10 wondering 26:12 visitation 93:23 yelling 74:24 75:11,20 79:25 146:21 users 64:10 word 50:7.8 90:12 visual 62:5 139:8 152:13 yesterday 7:12,16 usual 62:16 Volume 82:12 88:21 103:21 words 70:17 71:3 voluntary/ yield 133:12 v work 30:5,14 47:6 involuntary 75:8 48:19 52:11 103:12,18 York 69:24 volunteered 78:12 112:9 114:8 115:5 V-I-L-K-E 117:8 young 11:13 81:23 130:20 131:10 132:21

# Cyril Wecht - March 21, 2017 99:24 Z Zeigler 10:1